



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, SATURDAY, AUGUST 22, 2020

No. 149

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 25, 2020, at 2:30 p.m.

House of Representatives

SATURDAY, AUGUST 22, 2020

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
August 22, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRENDA L. LAWRENCE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:
God of us all, we thank You for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of the people's House gathered here at the Capitol for an extraordinary session in extraordinary times.

Inspire them with wisdom as they hope to address the needs of our Nation in such a difficult period of our shared history.

Continue to bless those who labor to attend to the sick among our citizens, and those also who strive to find effective treatments and vaccines. Keep us all safe, in Your divine mercy.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 967, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, first, I thank the Postal workers across this Nation who work so tirelessly to ensure we receive our mail in a timely fashion and are now doing it under tremendous difficulty. Almost every business, from the largest corporation to the smallest hometown operation, relies on the Postal Service.

But for those businesses, those families—medicine, food, and goods are in jeopardy, not from a foreign adversary and not from war, but from attack within our borders, from those in charge, from the Postmaster General.

Why?

What is the primary purpose?

It is to subvert an election.

Today and Monday we will combat that attack. We will give the funding and the procedures necessary to restore and support the U.S. Post Office.

We have also responded to the unanimous request of the Trump-appointed Postal Board of Governors for \$25 billion in much-needed emergency operational relief.

For over 200 years, neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night has stayed these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds. Let it not be on our watch that this legacy ends.

THE BLUFFS RESTAURANT

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, 10 years ago, the Bluffs Restaurant, a wonderfully historic establishment on the Blue Ridge Parkway in the Fifth District, closed its doors. Today it is reopening thanks to over 500 donors who contributed more than \$1 million for repairs.

In 1949 the Bluffs was the first restaurant to open on the Blue Ridge Parkway, and it served customers for more than 61 years. Generations of families have passed through its doors, and they have returned time and again. For them it is not just about the food, it is also about the countless memories that have been made there.

My plan was to attend the reopening event today. Unfortunately, I could

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4253

not. But I still want to thank owners Shana Whitehead and Bill Heath for re-opening and wish them the best in this endeavor.

PROTECTING THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, for 228 years the United States Postal Service has delivered for the American people. It is an institution built on trust, trust that the United States military veterans will receive their prescriptions each and every month, trust that Social Security recipients will receive their checks each and every month, and trust that small businesses can manage and grow with the assistance of the United States Postal Service.

Today, the trust and confidence of the United States Postal Service is under attack by the very administration and Postmaster General who should be protecting the time-honored tradition of that institution.

Yesterday we stood outside the mail processing facility in Buffalo where five sorting machines were removed without explanation.

This House will approve today the Delivering for America Act, an act to protect the United States Postal Service from the destructive acts of the President and his postmaster disaster.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO GSGT DIEGO PONGO

(Mr. GARCÍA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARCÍA of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a fallen warrior and a true American hero from the beautiful 25th District of California. Gunnery Sergeant Diego Pongo of Simi Valley was killed in action by enemy fire in the Makhmur Mountains of Iraq back on March 8 of this year. Diego was a marine and part of the elite MARSOC Raiders unit charged with eliminating entrenched bastions of ISIS in Iraq.

Because of delays as a result of the COVID pandemic, Gunnery Sergeant Pongo's funeral and formal ceremony were held just 2 days ago at the hallowed ground of Arlington National Cemetery.

I had the unfortunate honor to attend services along with his family. My thoughts and prayers are with Diego and his family, his parents, Kathryn and Carlos; his brothers, Andres and Jorge; his ex-wife, Randi; and most of all his beautiful 8-year-old daughter, Avery.

Madam Speaker, we lost a true American patriot and a hero, and we, as a nation, are eternally indebted to him and his family. May we never forget.

SUPPORTING THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

(Mrs. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, through the Civil War, the Spanish flu, the Great Depression, and two world wars, the United States Postal Service has not stopped. No matter the conditions—snow, rain, heat, or darkness—the dedicated men and women of the Postal Service have carried out their mission with pride. The Postal Service is one of the great pillars of our democracy. It is enshrined in the Constitution, and it is an essential service for so many.

The actions by the Postmaster General in recent weeks is a sabotage campaign aimed at manipulating the mail service, but whatever the intent, it is hurting everyday Americans—seniors, veterans, and working men and women.

In Michigan we have been told that just this month 10 mail sorting machines have been removed and destroyed. This American institution is being deliberately dismantled. It is not only an attack on the Postal Service, it is an attack on our Constitution, our way of life, and, yes, our democracy.

My message is simple: protect the Postal Service and our Republic.

PRESIDENT TRUMP PROMOTES UAE-ISRAELI PEACE TREATY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, this week's announcement of a U.S.-promoted peace treaty between the United Arab Emirates and Israel is an achievement of historic proportions. It is the clear result of President Donald Trump's bold foreign policy agenda with Jared Kushner creating peace through strength. This is a major step towards a more stable, peaceful, and prosperous Middle East in which all people and religions can co-exist and prosper.

Credit is due to President Trump, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, and Crown Prince of Abu Dhabi Mohammed bin Zayed Al Nahyan for their commitment to peace and prosperity.

The Washington Examiner editorial titled, "Team Trump Deserves Congratulations on UAE-Israel Peace Deal" is right. This agreement is a substantive and significant victory for Israelis, Emiratis, and the Trump administration.

UAE is ably represented in Washington by Yousef Al Otaiba working with Ambassador David Friedman in Jerusalem.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

DEGRADING THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the extraordinary men and women who serve us in the United States Postal Service.

I rise today to highlight President Trump's shameless attempts to degrade the United States Postal Service, a revered American institution. These actions not only undermine our elections, they are gambling with people's lives.

These past several weeks I have received thousands of emails, calls, and letters from constituents pleading that these changes be reversed. Just this week I heard from a constituent with diabetes who feared her family was at risk of losing their insurance after learning her payment had arrived 1 month late after it was mailed. Her story is, sadly one of many being heard across the Nation.

COVID-19 has already brought on significant financial trouble for so many families. To further hurt working families now facing late fees on rent or car payments through no fault of their own is unconscionable.

House Democrats have promised to get government working for the people, and today's bill is another example of that commitment.

Everybody loves the Post Office. It has been with us since the founding of our country, knitting together communities, and this attempt to undermine and degrade services is not only undermining services to our constituents, it is threatening our democracy.

A POLITICAL CONSPIRACY THEORY

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, NANCY PELOSI is dragging the entire House of Representatives back here to Washington, D.C., on taxpayer dollars for an unnecessary political vote.

Speaker PELOSI is choosing to vote on a political conspiracy theory regarding the United States Postal Service. Instead, the House should be working on commonsense COVID-19 legislation to address liability protections for States, counties, cities, schools, nonprofits, and businesses that are trying to reopen.

This bill is nothing more than an attempt to utilize the courts to shut down the 2020 election.

We need to stop wasting time on a sham political vote like H.R. 8015, because, in reality, House Democrats are the ones trying to scare the American people, blame President Trump, and, yes, undermine the 2020 election results.

In these days and weeks before the election, Democrats are clearly desperate.

Why can't we focus on providing COVID-19 relief, small business support, infrastructure, and rural broadband?

HONORING SALVATORE "SAL" ROTELLA

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a visionary who believed in education for the masses, Salvatore "Sal" Rotella. He dedicated his life to a uniquely American form of education—America's community colleges.

He led the Riverside Community College District from 1991 to 2007 while I was a trustee.

Sal oversaw the expansion of RCCD into a system of three separately accredited colleges while facing severe fiscal constraints.

He healed a divided faculty and continually challenged the board of trustees to do the right thing.

One of Sal's signature achievements was Passport to College which helped students believe that college was an attainable dream for them.

But Sal was more than just a leader. He was an exceptional family man and a mentor to me and so many others. He had a way of getting people to take their lives seriously, as if they really mattered.

Now that he is gone, I take comfort in knowing that his life's example will live on through others who have learned from him.

□ 1015

VITAMIN D SUPPLEMENTATION FOR COVID-19

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, at this time when the coronavirus is going on, I realize a lot of energy is expended as we work toward a possible vaccine, but I would like the Centers for Disease Control to bring up two other topics which may be helpful, though not quite as expensive.

One is three universities—Trinity in Dublin, Harvard, and Northwestern University—have shown that Vitamin D can do a lot toward lessening the damage of COVID.

Madam Speaker, 40 percent of Americans suffer from a lack of vitamin D, and you can get enough vitamin D—in addition to going outside, if you are not staying inside too much—you can get it at your local drugstore.

I wish the Centers for Disease Control would spend more time publicizing this, as 40 percent of Americans are short of vitamin D.

I also wish they would spend more time dealing with fenofibrate, which in

Israel they are looking at. Perhaps this common anticholesterol can also save a lot of lives as we await the vaccine.

RECOGNIZING PRISCILLA ACERO

(Mr. CORREA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Priscilla Arceo.

Santa Ana High School's valedictorian, Priscilla Arceo, made us proud when she appeared and earned the spot of student speaker at the national Graduate Together: America Honors the High School Student Class of 2020.

I also thank our Santa Ana High School principal, Jeff Bishop, for his support. And, of course, I thank the debate coach and teacher, Sal Tinajero, for bringing the debate program to Santa Ana High School. Mr. Tinajero continues to make champions out of these great kids at Santa Ana.

Madam Speaker, today, Priscilla is headed to the University of California for her college degree, and I extend congratulations to Priscilla.

CONGRATULATING GEORGIA ABBEY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Georgia Abbey on her recent retirement as executive director of Leadership Centre County.

Leadership Centre County was founded in 1991 and is dedicated to the development of qualified leaders within the Centre County community. Over the years, more than 1,000 members have graduated from the program who then went on to be committee chairs, board members, and volunteers in Centre County organizations. I am proud to be one of those Leadership Centre County graduates.

LCC has eight different values that all members strive to illustrate. These values include gratitude, mutual respect, and inclusion. The organization believes that effective leaders improve the quality of life for their communities.

For the past 21 years, Georgia Abbey has played a major role in achieving the goals of Leadership Centre County. Her result-oriented and high-energy management of LCC has contributed greatly to the tremendous success of this organization.

Madam Speaker, I wish Georgia and her husband, Kevin, all the best in the next phase of life following retirement.

COVID-19 WORSENING CHILD HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, COVID-19 is having a devastating impact on global hunger and food security, especially among children.

Even before the pandemic, malnutrition and hunger rates were alarmingly high. Globally, 144 million children suffer from stunting; wasting affects 47 million children; and hunger has risen by 60 million people since 2014. The pandemic could push over 130 million people into hunger by the end of 2020.

In July, The Lancet estimated that without timely action, the global prevalence of child wasting could rise by a shocking 14 percent, affecting nearly 7 million more children and causing more than 10,000 additional child deaths every month.

Madam Speaker, with such unprecedented need, Congress must act. We must help fund the global response to this COVID-19 pandemic. We must divert this potential hunger and malnutrition crisis. The children of the world, just like our own children, need us.

LACKING PREPAREDNESS FOR CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, it is that time of year again in California. Hundreds of thousands of acres are on fire—in our forests, in our open lands, even burning into some of our cities and our neighborhoods.

So, what is the deal? Once again, we are not prepared. Some of our Federal agencies were not prepared to have the equipment and the firefighters on hand, contracted, ready to go when we knew this was coming.

As well, our people who procure electricity and govern that were not ready for the rolling blackouts that would come along from the high heat waves, as well as some of the shutdowns that would have to occur in burning areas.

What is wrong with government agencies that do not plan to serve their people, to keep them safe from fire, and to help keep the electricity on?

What is wrong that they can't add up how many power plants that we have available online, how much hydropower we have, how much water behind the dams, how much we have available during these times of heat waves to help keep the lights on?

What is wrong with Federal agencies that cannot plan to have people, even during COVID, ready to go.

Madam Speaker, we have to do better because we are diserving our people.

KEEPING U.S. POSTAL SERVICE RUNNING

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I stand here today because the

United States Postal Service is under attack by the current administration.

This is an assault on our democracy and our economy, and it is hurting Americans across the country. It is hurting the veteran in my district from Pasadena, Texas, who receives his medications from the VA through the mail and who is now worried about what will happen to him if his medications get delayed.

It is hurting my neighbor from Lindale Park who cares for her elderly mother and didn't receive her Social Security check in the mail on time, further stressing her financial situation and leaving her unable to pay her mother's utilities.

And it is hurting the small businesses in my neighborhood in the Houston region, already crippled by this pandemic, that depend on the Postal Service to mail out payments and products.

Madam Speaker, we cannot stand by as people are hurting. The Postal Service delivers money, medicines, merchandise, and, yes, mail-in ballots.

Madam Speaker, we must keep the Postal Service running. People are hurting.

HONORING WORK OF OFFICER BROOKS YANDLE

(Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life-saving work of Officer Brooks Yandle of the White Lake Police Department.

Over the weekend of July 4, Officer Yandle responded to a call about a 43-year-old woman unresponsive to CPR. Upon arriving, Officer Yandle determined that the victim had overdosed on heroin, took quick action to resuscitate her, and saved her life.

This is not the first time Officer Yandle has acted to save lives. In 2016, he saved a grandmother and her four grandchildren found unconscious and suffering from carbon monoxide poisoning.

Officer Yandle's courage and decisiveness has saved multiple lives, and he is a credit to the noble profession of law enforcement. I am proud to pay tribute today to him and to the entire White Lake Police Department.

CALLING FOR EQUALITY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this morning, today, we have arrived in Washington to fight for postal workers, the United States Postal Service, in H.R. 8015. But I take this moment to acknowledge close to almost 175,000 dead Americans who have died from

COVID-19. I applaud those who have taken a moment out of their lives to march for those who have passed and mourn for those families.

This is not America. And I acknowledge something else that comes to my attention that hurts my heart as a mother, and that is the Trump administration's policy to separate children. That the United Nations has condemned it as torture and abuse of children—some upwards of 5,000 children. Their own White House immigration specialists, if you will, want it to be 25,000 children. This is not America.

Today, we fight for those who have come to our doors in rain, snow, or shine. We must also fight for the children and never again in America see any policy that snatches children away from their families. Immigrant or non-immigrant, we are Americans who have values that stand for something—equality and justice.

CONTROLLING INVASIVE ASIAN CARP

(Mr. BURCHETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, the United States Congress needs to get back to work. We need to start working on the issues that deal with our constituents.

One of those that is of great concern in Tennessee is invasive Asian carp. They are a nuisance in too many of our Nation's waterways, preventing folks from fully enjoying our Nation's lakes, rivers, and streams, and destroying our ecosystem.

Many in my district, including the residents of Tellico Village, have expressed legitimate concerns to folks at TVA and others over Asian carp and their potential spread into our local waters, and I have been proud to work with them to tackle this issue.

Madam Speaker, to control the spread of these pests, I have worked to secure \$25 million in funding in fiscal year 2021. If approved by the Senate, these resources, combined with language in the Water Resources Development Act, would allow researchers to study the reproductive habits of Asian carp in the Tennessee and Cumberland River basins so we are better equipped to battle these invaders.

I thank both the Committees on Appropriations and Transportation and Infrastructure for working with my office on these requests. Problematic Asian carp harass boaters, fishermen, and swimmers across this country of ours. My constituents are passionate about getting the Asian carp population under control and keeping them out of our waters.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to working with them further on this important local issue.

RECOGNIZING JOSEPH FABRIZIO AND HOLLAND MIDDLE SCHOOL'S EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the hard work and dedication of Mr. Joe Fabrizio and his eighth grade students at Holland Middle School in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

Each year, Mr. Fabrizio and his students write letters to our office on a variety of topics, and each year, reading these letters is something that our entire staff looks very much forward to.

Madam Speaker, one of the most important things that one can do as a citizen is to communicate with your elected officials by writing a letter, sending an email, making a call, or paying a visit. These students are playing their part in the political process, and these students at Holland Middle School know that the decisions that our government makes today will impact them, and eventually, it will be their turn to make decisions in their government.

I think my colleagues in the House would very much benefit from being able to review these letters, and so I will include the letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Madam Speaker, by taking the time to write our elected officials regarding issues important to them, it shows that these students truly care about our district and our Nation, and it should give all of us faith in the future of our Nation.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8015, DELIVERING FOR AMERICA ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-480) on the resolution (H. Res. 1092) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8015) to maintain prompt and reliable postal services during the COVID-19 health emergency, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DELIVERING FOR AMERICA ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1092 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1092

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House without intervention of any question of consideration the bill (H.R. 8015) to maintain prompt and reliable postal services during the COVID-19 health emergency, and for other purposes. All points of order against

consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-61, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Friday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1092, providing for consideration of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act, under a closed rule.

The rule itself executes a manager's amendment from Chairwoman MALONEY, provides 2 hours of general debate on the bill, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, we are here today because our democracy is being eroded by this administration. It is under siege on all fronts.

I read the report released this week by the Senate Intelligence Committee, a Republican-led committee. It was truly shocking. It found that some in the President's campaign created "notable counterintelligence vulnerabilities."

Make no mistake, they welcomed help from Russia, and they knowingly used intelligence from Putin's regime.

While this report was released, the President continued to attack his political enemies. He continued all of the lies. This week, he even floated the idea that America should hold a do-over of the upcoming election in November if he doesn't like the outcome.

Are you kidding me?

On top of this, this administration has moved to dismantle the United States Postal Service. We have all seen

the images of mailboxes uprooted. Others have been chained shut. Sorting machines have disappeared. Mail service has slowed to a crawl for some Americans, threatening the delivery of everything from medications to Social Security checks.

Did you know, Madam Speaker, that 80 percent of our veterans' prescription medications are delivered by mail? Why would anyone want to place their health in harm's way?

Why, Madam Speaker? Because this administration knows that more Americans than ever are likely to vote by mail in November. The U.S. Postal Service expects 10 times the normal amount of election mail because of the coronavirus pandemic. This President fears that if more people vote, the less likely he is to win a second term.

Now, we all recently mourned the passing of our dear friend, the great John Lewis. Not too long ago, he stood right here on this floor and he said: "When you see something that is not right, not fair, not just, you have to speak up; you have to say something; you have to do something."

Madam Speaker, what we are seeing today cannot be dismissed as Donald being Donald or the President just continuing to be provocative. This is scary stuff. It is frightening, and we have to do something.

In the face of extraordinary public pressure and action by this majority, the Postmaster General promised to halt further changes until after election day. But I have to tell you, I wouldn't trust this administration to tell me the correct time. Not only was there nothing in his statement about reversing the damage that has been already done, there was nothing about reinstalling boxes or sorting machines and nothing about treating election material as first-class mail.

But the Postmaster General made clear, since, that he has no intention of undoing what he has done. He doesn't plan on lifting a finger. He said as much in the Senate hearing yesterday. He made clear that he didn't even study the impact of these changes on our seniors before they were implemented. He didn't study the impact on our veterans first. Apparently, he just made them, Madam Speaker, struggling Americans be damned.

This administration isn't going to do a single thing about it, and this is why Congress must act.

Now, my friends on the other side have tried to claim there is no problem here. They have waved around charts that are weeks and weeks old to try to pretend that everything is just fine, that everything is just beautiful.

Well, I don't need some outdated statistics to tell me what is going on today, Madam Speaker. I don't need empty rhetoric from the occupant of the White House or Mr. DeJoy. My constituents are my evidence. They have flooded my office with calls. They have stopped me on the street. Something is happening here, whether this adminis-

tration or its allies want to admit it or not.

Before my friends on the other side try to paint this issue as some kind of liberal conspiracy, let me remind them: There is no money for hungry families here, although they badly need it; there is no funding for State and local governments here, though they are pleading with all of us for relief. We have already acted on all that. It is MITCH MCCONNELL over in the Senate who is determined to do absolutely nothing.

All this bill does is get the Postal Service back to where it was at the start of the year and provide them with the resources they need, not just to process an influx of ballots, but to continue delivering mail, including Americans' Social Security checks and medications. It ensures that they are able to continue delivering to places in rural America that their competitors just don't go, and it supports the Postal Service's more than 630,000 hard-working employees. And we all owe them a debt of gratitude for their service, especially during this pandemic.

Madam Speaker, if we don't undermine and tear apart the Postal Service, then they can handle the increase in mail-in ballots. They handled two to three times the volume of mail and packages at Christmastime, and they are determined to handle the volume of election-related mail. But they need their equipment; they need to pay their workers; they need confidence that management won't try to undercut them on the job; and they need support from this Congress, Democrats and Republicans.

That is it. This is all pretty bare bones, Madam Speaker. I don't see why in the world that Republicans won't join us on this. It shouldn't be a radical concept to suggest that, in the United States of America, every vote should count, whether it is for Donald Trump, Joe Biden, or someone else.

It shouldn't be a tough call to support the United States Postal Service. More than 90 percent of Americans view this agency favorably because it is their lifeline in so many ways.

Madam Speaker, this is a five-alarm fire on our democracy. I think our country is worth fighting for. I hope all my colleagues join together to help us save it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding, but that is probably where our agreement is going to end today.

We are not here because democracy is under siege. We are here because the Democratic House leadership is underperforming. We haven't gotten appropriations bills negotiated to the White House. We haven't gotten transportation bills negotiated to the White House. We haven't gotten water infrastructure bills negotiated to the White

House. I can go on and on and on. And we are here today with yet another bill that there is absolutely no effort to negotiate and send to the White House.

Madam Speaker, you are going to hear more about Donald Trump today than you are going to hear about the Postal Service today, and that is because we are not here about the Postal Service. We are here for another round of attacks on President Trump.

I get it. Folks don't like President Trump on this side of the aisle. I get it. Folks have concerns about President Trump's rhetoric on all sides of the aisle.

But the Postal Service has \$10 billion. I asked the question yesterday, Madam Speaker: For the \$25 billion bailout package we are here about today, how much of that money are we going to spend this year? How much do we need to protect the election infrastructure my friend from Massachusetts just described? I couldn't get an answer. Folks didn't know an answer.

Conveniently, we are going to have the Postmaster General called before the House for a hearing for these answers in about 48 hours. About 2 days after we have passed this bill, we are going to get all the answers about why this bill may or may not be necessary.

What my friend from Massachusetts said—I have gotten pessimistic, in light of our 6-hour Rules Committee hearing yesterday. I actually agree with my friend from Massachusetts on much more. He is right that we owe a thank-you to our men and women of the Postal Service for the work that they are doing.

The previous Postmaster General came to Congress in the spring, worried that mail volume was going to collapse and the Postal Service was going to enter a period of financial instability. The truth, Madam Speaker, is just the opposite. Postal office deliveries have exploded. Folks are doing e-commerce like never before. Our men and women of the Postal Service are working harder than ever before, delivering more packages today than they were 6 months ago. And we owe them a big, big thank-you for their work during these times. My friend from Massachusetts is right: It is a lifeline for so many families.

Madam Speaker, it is an election year. Who believes that serving their constituents comes from denying veterans access to prescription drugs? Nobody. If that is what this was about, we would have gotten together, Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, Congress and the White House, and we would be moving legislation in a cooperative way.

We heard from the ranking Republican yesterday on the committee. He wasn't consulted in these conversations. He wasn't brought in to these conversations. There are no Republican amendments here. There is no conversation going on with the Senate. This is another wasteful partisan exercise in a time when—my friend from

Massachusetts is absolutely right—there are real crises that need to be addressed.

I had hoped when we were called back on a Saturday, Madam Speaker, it would have been to address one of those crises. But the truth is, it is just the punctuation mark at the end of the Democratic National Convention week. And to the leadership's credit, they scheduled it so that it wouldn't interfere with the Republican National Convention next week.

How convenient that our scheduling was dictated by two political conventions, because that is the only reason that we are here today, Madam Speaker: politics.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am just getting a little sick and tired of all of the excuses as to why my Republican friends don't want to join us in helping the American people.

My friend mentioned the appropriations bills. Well, with all due respect, we passed almost all of them here in the House. My friend, the Republican leader in the Senate, hasn't done a damn thing, hasn't passed one.

We passed the HEROES Act, which would have helped the Postal Service, which would have provided relief to cities and towns, which would have provided assistance to those in this country who are going hungry. The Senate majority leader hasn't done a damn thing, not anything, hasn't lifted a finger for anybody. And we have even agreed to meet him halfway. He still won't negotiate.

On an infrastructure bill, we passed an infrastructure bill here. Negotiate with the Senate? They haven't passed a damn thing. It is malpractice. If politicians could be sued for malpractice, then the Senate majority leader would be sued. This is ridiculous.

And here we are with a crisis in the Postal Service. Mail has slowed down all across the country. Members are getting calls, including Republican Members. And what is the response? Oh, well, we will just let it go. You know, we will say we need to do better. We will deal with this another day.

This is ridiculous, it is unconscionable, and I am tired of the excuses.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, this President is on a warpath to destroy the Postal Service and, through that, our elections.

After months of hearing this President, and now Republican Members of Congress, spread conspiracy theories and misinformation about voting by mail, he has made GOP megadonor Louis DeJoy his new chief of chaos in voter suppression.

In an attack on the Postal Service, DeJoy has removed mail processing equipment, collection boxes, and cut

back on overtime. Ninety Democrats, led by Congresswoman KATHERINE CLARK and me, already demanded his immediate removal.

Because, on top of this blatant voter suppression, Trump and DeJoy are hurting millions who depend on the Postal Service every day: seniors and veterans waiting for lifesaving medications, families waiting for paychecks, small businesses with delayed packages whose very survival is already threatened by COVID-19.

On Thursday, the Progressive Caucus held a hearing and heard from David Williams, the former vice president of the Postal Service Board of Directors, who resigned in protest to Trump's actions. What he told us, unfortunately, shocked no one: that the Postal Service was fully prepared for mail voting until this administration manufactured an intentional crisis; that DeJoy wasn't selected by the firm that was hired to find a new Postmaster General, but he was the only candidate interviewed and was unqualified to lead the Postal Service; and that Steve Mnuchin sought intrusive control over core Postal Service operations and wanted to impose a pricing practice that would ruin the Postal Service.

This chaos is not the result of a pandemic. This chaos was manufactured by the administration and is intentional.

That is why Congress is acting today.

We are reversing Louis DeJoy's disastrous actions and providing the Postal Service with the funding it so desperately needs. We won't let anyone dismantle our Postal Service. The Postal Service belongs to the people.

□ 1045

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Ordinarily, I am concerned that I only have 30 minutes for Rule Committee debate, but the lunacy that we are hearing down here today makes me glad that we are going to be done with this in 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, you know when Elijah Cummings chaired the committee and MARK MEADOWS was the ranking member, now President Trump's chief of staff, we came together to do Postal Service reforms because we all know the Postal Service needs to be reformed. We all know this. We could do it today, if it was about Postal Service reform, if it was about Postal Service improvement, but it is not.

What is the solution today? Throw more money at a problem. We don't trust the Postmaster General, the other side says. We don't trust the President, the other side says. So what is the solution to the manufactured crisis? Give \$25 billion to the Postmaster General and the President of the United States.

In response to my assertion that this House is a do-nothing Congress because it fails to negotiate with the Senate and the White House, my friend from Massachusetts lists half a dozen bills

that this House passed unilaterally with no effort to negotiate with the Senate or negotiate with the White House.

Madam Speaker, if what we want to do is come and talk, we have a wonderful Chamber in which to do it. If what we want to do is come in and get something done, it can only get done together. This is yet another example of the House leadership's failure to operate in a partnership fashion.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), one of the greatest negotiators in the House, a gentleman who has a long history of bipartisanship, and thus, legislative success, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend for yielding and very much appreciate his leadership on our committee.

Madam Speaker, I want to rise to oppose both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Before I do, though, I include in the RECORD four newspaper articles discussing the majority's concern about the Postal Service. The first is a Wall Street Journal editorial; a column by Rich Lowry appearing in the New York Post; a column by Byron York, appearing in the Washington Examiner; and a column by Ruth Goldway, a former commissioner of the Postal Service, appearing in the New York Times.

All four articles make it clear that the majority's reasons for bringing this legislation, frankly, are ludicrous, and that what they are proposing actually will make it more difficult to reform.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 17, 2020]

NANCY PELOSI GOES POLITICALLY POSTAL
(By the Editorial Board)

Speaker Nancy Pelosi is calling the House back into session this week to address fears that the U.S. Postal Service is being infiltrated by alien lizard people posing as letter carriers. OK, it isn't quite that bad. The actual conspiracy theory holds that President Trump is strangling the USPS to hack the November election.

But talk about "unsubstantiated," as the press likes to call Donald Trump's Twitter emissions. Democrats should be deeply embarrassed that their leadership has embraced such claims. Two Congressmen, including Democratic Caucus Chairman Hakeem Jeffries, wrote to the FBI on Monday to urge, if you can believe it, a criminal investigation of Postmaster General Louis DeJoy.

"This conspiracy theory is the most far-flung thing I think I've ever heard," says Stephen Kearney, who worked at the USPS for 33 years, including as treasurer and a senior vice president. "DeJoy was not appointed by President Trump," but by the USPS's bipartisan governors. (Who, as it happens, selected him unanimously.)

"You can find valid operational reasons for the actions taken by the Postal Service so far," says Mike Plunkett, another longtime USPS executive who now leads the Association for Postal Commerce. "In no way do I detect any criminality behind them, and I'm at a loss as to how one would reach that conclusion."

The Democratic letter to the FBI cites news reports that the USPS is decommissioning hundreds of mail-sorting machines.

But the context is that overall mail volume has fallen 33% since 2006. "They've been taking machines out of service for years now, and I've been encouraging them to do it more aggressively," says Hamilton Davison, the president of the American Catalog Mailers Association. "I think that's a good thing for America, because we don't want to pay for stuff that we don't need."

Mr. Kearney, who now runs the Alliance of Nonprofit Mailers, concurs. "It's obvious, to be efficient and not waste money, you need to take out some of that capacity," he says. His group has similarly been urging productivity improvements, "because if they don't do that, our postage rates are going to go way up." A leaked USPS document floating in the online ether is titled "Equipment Reduction." But it's dated May 15, and Mr. DeJoy took over June 15.

Another claim is that the USPS is pulling blue collection bins off the street en masse. "They're going around literally with tractor trailers picking up mailboxes," Joe Biden said last week. "I mean, it's bizarre!" The USPS says it has nearly 142,000 boxes across the country, which are adjusted as volume and costs dictate. In August 2016, the USPS's Inspector General said that "the number of collection boxes declined by more than 12,000 in the past 5 years." Voter suppression by the Obama Administration?

Alarmed Twitter users last week posted a photo of mailboxes on a flatbed truck in New Jersey. Oops: "Morristown Mayor Tim Dougherty said the mailboxes were being replaced with new anti-fishing boxes," the local newspaper explained. On Monday the USPS said it would postpone this security upgrade for 90 days "while we evaluate our customers' concerns"—in other words, to keep jittery partisans on the internet from losing their minds before Nov. 3.

Mr. DeJoy is being knocked for trying to cut overtime costs. But is it any wonder? The day he was sworn in, the Inspector General reported that in 2019 the post office "spent \$1.1 billion in mail processing overtime and penalty overtime, \$280 million in late and extra transportation, and \$2.9 billion in delivery overtime and penalty overtime costs." For context, the USPS's overall loss that year was \$8.8 billion.

Mrs. Pelosi is trying to put on a political show, starring Democrats as the saviors of the post office. She says she wants to pass a bill that "prohibits the Postal Service from implementing any changes to operations or level of service it had in place on January 1." Also in the mix may be a \$25 billion cash infusion. Then Chuck Schumer will demand that the Senate come back to town for the same vote. By the way the letter-carriers union endorsed Joe Biden on the weekend.

This is a made-for-TV phony political crisis. The USPS has long-term challenges, but enough money to last into 2021. Mr. DeJoy says there's "ample capacity to deliver all election mail." Some states have startlingly lax ballot deadlines, but nobody can pretend with a straight face that it's the post office's fault. Democrats have also scheduled a hearing for next Monday so they can yell at Mr. DeJoy in person. How long before Rep. Adam Schiff says it's another Russia-Donald Trump conspiracy to steal the election?

[Aug. 17, 2020]

THE LEFT'S LUNATIC 'POSTAL' CONSPIRACY
THEORY

(By Rich Lowry)

At this rate, Postmaster General Louis DeJoy will be lucky if he isn't arrested and tried for treason before a people's tribunal.

DeJoy has quickly replaced Vladimir Putin as the man that progressive opinion will hold responsible if Trump wins a second term in November.

According to House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, DeJoy is a "complicit crony" aiding Trump's effort to sabotage American democracy. She believes the two have hatched a plot to delay mail-in voting and disenfranchise countless Americans prior to the election.

Protesters over the weekend showed up at DeJoy's Washington apartment and North Carolina home. Two Democratic congressmen have called for a criminal inquiry into his changes at the postal service, and he will testify at a House hearing next week.

In tried and true fashion, President Trump has stoked suspicions by saying that he opposes a \$25 billion postal-service bailout in the latest Democratic COVID-relief bill. According to Trump, blocking this measure—and \$3 billion in election aid to the states—will prevent universal mail-in voting.

But the bailout doesn't have anything to do with mail-in voting, and given the billions of pieces of mail handled by the post office every week, it surely can handle the increased volume from mail-in voting.

It is true that Postmaster General DeJoy is a major Trump donor. He made his fortune in shipping and logistics, though, and he was selected by the postal service's board of governors.

Little did he know when he took over the agency in June that he'd soon have a starring role in the country's latest psychodrama. Every change at the postal service is now seen through the prism of a belief that the agency is a tool of creeping authoritarianism.

Letter collection boxes are being removed—never mind that this has been an ongoing process for years. Underused boxes are decommissioned or moved to higher-traffic areas. In 2009, The Washington Post reported that 200,000 boxes had been shelved over the prior two decades. In 2016, the inspector general noted that another 12,000 collection boxes had been cut over the previous five years.

Letter collection boxes all of the sudden have big red locks on them—well, yeah, as an off-hours device to prevent the theft of mail, something the service has also done for years.

The postal service is deactivating mail-sorting machines—right, and there was a plan for this prior to DeJoy becoming postmaster general, and it has been long discussed in response to the declining volume of mail.

DeJoy is cutting back on overtime—indeed he is, because artificially swollen overtime is an enormous expense that he hopes to eliminate with a more rational delivery system.

Democrats and much of the media make it sound as though the post office was an efficient, smooth-running agency before DeJoy took charge and then, at Trump's behest, transformed it into place struggling to keep up with broadbased changes in how we communicate.

In reality, the post office has lost nearly \$80 billion since 2007, and it lost more than \$2 billion last quarter. Unless the service finds a way to innovate, it is headed for bankruptcy.

This is the impetus for DeJoy's reforms, which should be welcomed by all the people now caterwauling about how essential the post office is to the American way of life.

DeJoy has been adamant that the postal service will do its job regarding mail-in ballots. The post office's recent warnings to states that they should be mindful of how quickly ballots can be delivered were played up as yet another assault on mail-in balloting. To the contrary, they were intended to avoid unrealistically late deadlines for mail-in voting that could create a trainwreck in November.

But in their inflamed state, Democrats want a villain—if not a foreign potentate,

then the guy in charge of delivering the mail.

[From the Washington Examiner]

A REALITY-BASED LOOK AT TRUMP AND THE POST OFFICE

(By Byron York)

The news is filled with reports of President Trump's "assault" on the U.S. Postal Service. The president, Democrats and some in the media say, is deliberately slowing mail delivery and crippling the Postal Service so that it cannot handle an anticipated flood of voting by mail in the presidential election. Former President Barack Obama said Trump is trying to "actively kneecap" the Postal Service to suppress the vote. Speaker Nancy Pelosi has called the House back into session this week and has set an "urgent hearing" for Aug. 24, demanding Postmaster General Louis DeJoy and the head of the Postal Service Board of Governors testify "to address the sabotage of the Postal Service."

Some of the accusations have grown so frantic that they resemble the frenzy of a couple of years ago over the allegation, from many of the same people, that Trump had conspired with Russia to fix the 2016 election. Now, it's the Postal Service. But what actually is going on? Here is a brief look at some of the issues involved.

142.5 BILLION PIECES OF MAIL

The idea that the Postal Service will not be able to handle the volume of mail in the election, or not be able to handle it within normal Postal Service time guidelines, does not make much sense. According to its most recent annual report, last year, in fiscal year 2019, the Postal Service handled 142.5 billion pieces of mail. "On a typical day, our 633,000 employees physically process and deliver 471 million mailpieces to nearly 160 million delivery points," the report says. This year, that number is higher, given the Postal Service's delivery of census forms and stimulus checks. Those alone added about 450 million additional pieces of mail.

In 2016, about 136 million Americans voted in the presidential election. The number will probably be a bit higher this year. If officials sent ballots to every single American registered to vote, about 158 million people, and then 140 million people returned ballots, the roughly 298 million pieces of mail handled over the course of several weeks would be well within the Postal Service's ability to handle. Of course, officials will not send a ballot to every American registered to vote, and not every voter will vote by mail. Whatever the final number is, the ballots that are cast by mail will not cripple a system that delivers 471 million pieces of mail every day.

There are, of course, compelling examples of election dysfunction, most notably the mess New York made of some of its congressional primaries this summer. But rather than representing a Postal Service problem, that was because some states are unprepared for a dramatic increase of voting by mail. The states have to prepare the ballots, address them, and process and count them when the Postal Service delivers them. That is the focus of the entirely legitimate fears of a possible vote-counting disaster this year. But it's not the Postal Service.

\$25 BILLION FOR WHAT?

Some news reports have left the impression that the Postal Service will not be able to handle mail-in ballots without an immediate infusion of money from Congress. That is not the case.

The Postal Service is not funded by a regular appropriation. It is, instead, an "independent agency" and is expected to support itself, beyond a yearly appropriation of about \$55 million to cover the costs of mail

for the blind and overseas balloting in elections.

The Postal Service has lost money for a very long time. In fiscal year 2019, it had operating revenues of \$71.1 billion and operating expenses of \$79.9 billion, leaving it with a deficit of \$8.8 billion. At the moment, Postal Service officials have told Congress, it has about \$14 billion in cash on hand, putting it on the road to fiscal insolvency (without further aid) in late 2021.

In the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act, or CARES Act, the \$2 trillion relief measure passed in March, Congress gave the Postal Service a \$10 billion borrowing authority. After the bill became law, there were negotiations between the Postal Service and the Treasury Department on the terms of the borrowing; a deal was announced in July. The ability to borrow \$10 billion, the postmaster general said, would "delay the approaching liquidity crisis."

That was all the aid for the Postal Service in the CARES Act. Completely separately, the bill also gave \$400 million to something called the Election Assistance Commission for distribution to states to "prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus, domestically or internationally, for the 2020 federal election cycle."

The next mega-relief package, a \$3 trillion bill known as the Health and Economic Recovery Omnibus Emergency Solutions Act, or HEROES Act, was passed by the House in May by a vote of 208 to 199. The winning total of 208 votes was comprised of 207 Democrats and one Republican. Fourteen Democrats and one independent voted against the measure. The bill has so far gone nowhere in the Republican-controlled Senate.

The House HEROES Act would give \$25 billion to the Postal Service in what is essentially a bailout. The bill mentions nothing about helping the Postal Service handle the upcoming election or any other election. Indeed, the only stipulation at all placed on the \$25 billion is that the Postal Service, "during the coronavirus emergency, shall prioritize the purchase of, and make available to all Postal Service employees and facilities, personal protective equipment, including gloves, masks, and sanitizers, and shall conduct additional cleaning and sanitizing of Postal Service facilities and delivery vehicles." If the House Democrats who wrote and passed the bill intended the money to be spent specifically for elections, they did not say so in the text of the legislation.

Separate from the Postal Service provisions, the bill would give \$3.6 billion to the Election Assistance Commission for distribution to states "for contingency planning, preparation, and resilience of elections for federal office." There has been some confusion about that; some discussion of the current controversy has left the impression that Democrats want \$3.6 billion for the Postal Service for the election. In fact, the \$3.6 billion would be for the states' election use. In neither the CARES Act, which is now law, nor the HEROES Act, which has been passed by the House but not the Senate, is there any money given to the Postal Service specifically for the election. In any event, the Postal Service has the capacity to handle the election and does not need any additional money specifically to do the job.

THE LATEST REFORM PROPOSAL

Whatever its other concerns at the moment, the Postal Service does have chronic financial problems. This year, Trump chose DeJoy, who made a fortune in shipping and logistics and whose former company was a contractor of the Postal Service for many years, as the new postmaster general. (DeJoy is also a major donor to Republicans and the Trump campaign.) DeJoy has attempted to

deal with some of the Postal Service's systemic problems with a pilot program to make deliveries more efficient while reducing the Postal Service's crippling overtime costs, which added up to more than \$1 billion in fiscal year 2018.

In the past, postal delivery worked this way: A worker would arrive in the morning and work on various things in the office—sorting mail, handling holds on mail, waiting for incoming mail to arrive to prepare for delivery. That often involved waiting around for hours and then starting an actual delivery route later in the day. Once started, a route has to be finished, and that involved workers going into overtime as they delivered through their route as evening approached.

DeJoy's plan, now being implemented in a pilot program in about 200 cities, is called Expedited to Street/Afternoon Sortation, or ESAS. Under it, a worker would arrive in the morning, collect all the mail that was ready to go out, and head out for delivery—"retrieve, load, and go." Then, after finishing the delivery route, the carrier would return to the office and do in the afternoon the office work that used to be done in the morning. That way, when the end of his or her shift arrived, that would be the end of the workday, with no overtime incurred. Mail that arrived to the office in the afternoon, while the carrier was doing office work, would be delivered in the next morning's route. It would be ready and waiting when the carrier arrived for "retrieve, load, and go."

The effect to customers would be that mail that was delivered to the office in the afternoon would be delivered the next morning, instead of that evening. The effect to the Postal Service would be to save an enormous amount of money in overtime.

In addition, there have been reports of the Postal Service removing collection boxes and sorting machines. While some Democrats and journalists have portrayed that as another effort toward voter suppression, the fact is the number of letters the Postal Service handles each year has declined for 20 years since the arrival of email. In those last two decades, the Postal Service has downsized its capabilities as the number of letters handled has decreased. Here is how the Washington Post described the situation, specifically concerning sorting machines: "Purchased when letters not packages made up a greater share of postal work, the bulky and aging machines can be expensive to maintain and take up floor space postal leaders say would be better devoted to boxes. Removing underused machines would make the overall system more efficient, postal leaders say. The Postal Service has cut back on mail-sorting equipment for years since mail volume began to decline in the 2000s."

Some Democrats have characterized the current reform efforts, much needed in an agency losing so much money, as part of the president's master plan to steal the election. But together, the Expedited to Street/Afternoon Sortation program and the cutback in sorting capacity would seem to be reasonable measures of the type the Postal Service needs to implement, and indeed has been implementing over the years. Yet this is what Democrats, and some of their allies in the press, have labeled as an "assault" on the Postal Service.

NIGHTMARE SCENARIOS

Many news accounts have included stories of Americans suffering from interruptions in Postal Service deliveries. For example, a story in the New York Times headlined "Postal Crisis Ripples Across Nation As Election Looms" included the story of Victoria Brownworth, a freelance journalist in

Philadelphia. "For Ms. Brownworth, who was paralyzed four years ago, the mail is her lifeline," the New York Times said, "delivering prescriptions and checks and mail-in ballots to her Philadelphia home. But that lifeline has snapped. She said she had received mail just twice in the past three weeks, and she dreaded November's election, worried that her ballot would suffer the same fate as the oxygen tube that she ordered three weeks ago—and that had still not arrived."

Other news reports have included many other examples. They are largely, if not entirely, anecdotal. While each is serious for the person involved, at the moment, it is impossible to tell how much of a national problem they represent. People who keep track of the Postal Service suspect that many of the stories are rooted in workforce availability problems related to the coronavirus pandemic, plus the changes in operations (for example, closing a facility to clean it during an outbreak) that have become part of life during the pandemic. The Postal Service would not be the only large organization that has found it impossible to operate as usual during the crisis.

There is also the fact that the Postal Service does, on occasion, fail to deliver the mail. In its annual reports, it includes data on "performance outcomes." For example, for first-class mail, which is the type of mail that would be most employed for election purposes, the goal in fiscal year 2019 was to deliver 96% of letters in one to three business days. Its actual performance was 92%. So 8% of first-class letters were not delivered on time. Now, consider that the Postal Service handled 54.9 billion pieces of first-class mail in fiscal year 2019. That is more than 4 billion pieces of first-class mail that were not delivered on time. And that, in a fraught political situation, could be the basis for a lot of anecdotes in news articles.

Many of those anecdotes, by the way, appear to have made it to the media with the help of the Postal Service unions. There are two major unions representing Postal Service workers. On Friday, the largest postal union, the National Association of Letter Carriers, endorsed Democratic candidate Joe Biden for president. In June, another union, the American Postal Workers Union, endorsed Biden as well. In 2016, both unions endorsed Hillary Clinton. In 2008 and 2012, both unions endorsed Barack Obama. In 2004, they endorsed John Kerry. And so on.

One more note about delivery times. A few days ago, the Washington Post published a story headlined "Postal Service warns 46 states their voters could be disenfranchised by delayed mail-in ballots." The paper obtained letters from Postal Service leadership to various states informing them that some of their election deadlines are "incongruous with the Postal Service's delivery standards." The resulting "mismatch," the Postal Service said, "creates a risk that ballots requested near the deadline under state law will not be returned by mail in time to be counted under your laws as we understand them." In other words, several states are not giving the Postal Service long enough to deliver a ballot to a voter and then deliver the filled-in ballot to the state election board. For example, if a state's law allows a voter to request a ballot seven days before the general election but also requires that votes must be received by election day to be counted—that would be a recipe for a lot of votes not being counted. It was an entirely reasonable concern on the part of the Postal Service, and it is a problem more for the states than the Postal Service. Yet media discussion of the story suggested it was just another chapter in what one source in the Washington Post account called "the

weaponization of the U.S. Postal Service for the president's electoral purposes."

TRUMP CONFUSES EVERYTHING

Despite the heated rhetoric, many of the Postal Service's problems are relatively clear, if extremely difficult to solve. In the context of the upcoming election, Trump has repeatedly added confusion to the situation, most recently with extended discussions in a television interview on Thursday and a press conference on Friday.

In the press conference, Trump was asked, "If the Democrats were to give you some of what you want . . . would you be willing to accept the \$25 billion for the Postal Service, including the three and a half billion dollars to handle mail-in voting?" As has happened many times in this controversy, the question conflated the Democrats' proposal for \$25 billion for the Postal Service and the request for \$3.6 billion for the Election Assistance Commission. In any event, Trump answered, "Sure, if they give us what we want." He then began to elaborate on other policy priorities.

"So, if they were to give you that, you would sign off for the money for the Postal Service?"

"Yeah, but they're not giving it to me," Trump said. "They're giving it to the American people."

"But if they were to agree to that—"

"Yeah, I would," Trump said. "I would certainly do that. Sure, I would do that. Yeah."

The next day, Friday, Trump spoke to Fox News's Maria Bartiromo. "They [Democrats] want \$3.5 billion for the mail-in votes, OK, universal mail-in ballots, \$3.5 billion," Trump said. "They want \$25 billion for the post office. Now, they need that money in order to have the post office work so it can take all of these millions and millions of ballots. Now in the meantime, they aren't getting there. By the way, those are just two items. But if they don't get those two items, that means you can't have universal mail-in voting because they're not equipped to have it."

In fact, while the \$3.5 billion proposal for the Election Assistance Commission (it is actually \$3.6 billion) is specifically for the purpose of facilitating mail-in voting, the \$25 billion for the Postal Service is basically a bailout. In April, the previous postmaster general, Megan Brennan, citing a "steep drop" in mail volume during the coronavirus crisis, had asked for far more—\$75 billion. The Postal Service didn't get anywhere near that much money in the first relief bill, the CARES Act—just \$10 billion in borrowing authority. So when the second relief mega-bill came up, Democrats threw in \$25 billion for the Postal Service. It was not about mail-in voting. (On Sunday morning, White House chief of staff Mark Meadows, who as a congressman followed postal issues closely, said the administration offered House Democrats \$10 billion for the Postal Service.)

Nevertheless, the president connected the two and suggested that the Postal Service needed the \$25 billion, and the Election Assistance Commission needed \$3.5 billion, to handle ballots in the election, and that he would not give it to them for that very reason.

"How would you like to have \$3.5 billion, billion, for mail-in voting?" Trump asked. "So, if you don't have it—do you know how much money that is? Nobody has any idea . . . Oh, \$3.5 billion. They want \$25 billion for the Post Office because the Post Office is going to have to go to town to get these ridiculous ballots in . . . Now, if we don't make a deal, that means they don't get the money. That means they can't have universal mail-in voting. They just can't have it."

The bottom line was that Trump made a mess of the issue. He didn't make a case against universal mail-in voting, which does not exist in the United States. He didn't make clear why Democrats wanted \$25 billion for the post office. He suggested that not agreeing to the \$25 billion was a way to stop universal mail-in voting, which it is not. He didn't address the serious problems at the Postal Service which need attention and do not have anything to do with voting. In all, he left the issue more confused than it had been beforehand—and that was saying something.

DEMOCRATS SMELL VICTORY

On Friday, the Washington Post published a story headlined "Trump's assault on the U.S. Postal Service gives Democrats a new campaign message." Put aside the casual use of the word "assault." The fact is, Pelosi, Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer, and other top Democrats are jumping on the Postal Service controversy with both feet. "Democrats are already blanketing the airwaves, latching on to the opportunity to highlight support [for the Postal Service]," the paper reported. Obama has joined in, tweeting that seniors and veterans and small businesses "can't be collateral damage for an administration more concerned with suppressing the vote than suppressing a virus."

The Democratic commentariat cheered and signaled it is ready to press the issue until election day. "Trump donor & Postmaster General Louis DeJoy should be in the crosshairs of every relevant congressional committee, inspector general, prosecutor, investigative journalist, whistleblower, class action lawyer, editorial board, etc. etc. etc.," tweeted former U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara. No doubt that is precisely what will happen in the Democratic world and some major media outlets between now and Nov. 3. But shouldn't someone, sometime take a look at what is actually happening?

[From the New York Times, Aug. 18, 2020]

I WAS A POSTAL SERVICE REGULATOR FOR 18 YEARS. DON'T PANIC.

(By Ruth Y. Goldway)

President Trump has threatened to withhold funds from the United States Postal Service. The new postmaster general, Louis DeJoy, has embarked on cost-cutting measures to eliminate overtime and remove sorting machines. These actions have created worries that Americans, reluctant to walk into voting booths because of Covid-19, will be unable to vote by mail this year.

I served as a regulator of the Postal Service for nearly 18 years under three presidents and I urge everyone to be calm. Don't fall prey to the alarmists on both sides of this debate. The Postal Service is not incapacitated. It is still fully capable of delivering the mail. The focus of our collective concerns should be on how the Postal Service can improve the speed of delivery for election mail.

First, the president is wrong about the Postal Service's finances. While the agency indeed has financial problems, as a result of a huge increase in packages being sent through the system and a credit line through the CARES Act, it has access to about \$25 billion in cash. Its own forecasts predict that it will have enough money to operate into 2021.

The Postal Service's shaky financial situation has to do in large part with the drop in first-class mail (typically used for letters), about 30 percent less than a decade ago. But the service's expensive, overbuilt infrastructure can absorb the addition of more mail in 2020—including election mail that is mailed to and sent back by every voter in every state.

The new postmaster general's management team still includes many knowledgeable and seasoned executives. And the Postal Service has over 500,000 employees who are remarkably honest, dedicated and used to working through emergencies: hurricanes, snow storms, social unrest and pandemics.

While the Postal Service has contemplated many different approaches to modernizing and improving efficiency, there has not been a consensus on how much the service should reduce costs. It is not at all surprising that Mr. DeJoy's choice of particularly visible cuts has raised alarms.

The Office of the Inspector General of the Postal Service has agreed to a review of the changes. And Congress has been called back to conduct its own review next week, restore trust in the institution and ensure that voting by mail proceeds smoothly.

Given that there is enough money and perhaps more if the president agrees to additional bailout funds; that there is plenty of capacity in the system; and that voting by mail can alleviate a health threat to the nation, the Postal Service should be made to handle all election mail as if it were first-class mail. This is where the policy discussions surrounding the Postal Service should settle.

Most election-related mail is sent at non-profit rates. The 1993 National Voter Registration Act requires the Postal Service to charge state and local election offices the same price for postage as nonprofit mailers. The Postal Service has a history of providing extra care and attention to election-related mail, on the level of first-class mail: usually two to four days for delivery. A special logo and bar code identifiers were created so that mail sorters were able to pull election mail out from the routine mail stream to be sure it was delivered as soon as possible.

But a recent letter sent by Thomas J. Marshall, the general counsel for the Postal Service, to election officials around the country seems to suggest that election mail will now be treated like regular nonprofit mail (typically three to 10 days for delivery) and may take as long as 15 days. This is not acceptable.

The Postal Service has the capacity to ensure that ballots sent to voters arrive on time and that ballots dropped into the system by voters are postmarked and delivered in times that accord with state and local guidelines. In their meeting with Congress next week, the leaders of the Postal Service should guarantee that election mail will continue to be treated as first-class mail. The Congress should agree that there will be no additional financial support for the Postal Service without this promise.

But state and local election officials must also recognize the possibilities of delays and plan for earlier mailings so there will be more days for ballots to be returned. Voters must be reminded to send in requests for ballots, change of address, voter registration forms and especially filled-out ballots as early as possible.

The Postal Service does indeed need a bailout from Congress so that it can be counted on to deliver the mail, medicines and other vital products for years to come. It needs funds to rebuild its more than 30,000 post offices and aging vehicle fleet to reduce its reliance on temporary workers and to broaden the range of services it provides. But these problems do not affect this year's election.

Americans must continue to support the Postal Service, whose existence is enshrined in our Constitution, by using its vote-by-mail services to save lives now and to protect our democracy in the future.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule for a very simple rea-

son. It is a silly rule. It actually violates the rules that my friends passed at the beginning of this Congress. The legislation before us has not gone through any committee, has not been marked up, has not been debated, has not been amended.

My friend said at the beginning of the Congress they wouldn't bring legislation like that to the floor, they conveniently waived that rule yesterday. So here it comes with no committee procedure or markup. We had a number of amendments, Madam Speaker, that were presented to the committee, none of them were made in order.

I offered an amendment for what is called an open rule, where any Member could come down here and put forward what they thought would be a better idea since we had no opportunity to do that in committee. That too was rejected.

So this rule is a take-it-or-leave-it ultimatum from the majority, and it means you can pass it in the House, but it is not going anywhere else.

Now, let's turn to the bill itself. My friends say that—we are going to hear a lot of bad things about the Postmaster General in the course of the morning. I have never met him. I don't know him. The people that do know him say that he is a really good guy, but I don't know. We are going to hear a lot of terrible things about him. But at the end of the day my friends are going to vote to give him \$25 billion, and they are going to do it in a bill that has no reforms in it, just says you can't change anything. Now, how smart is that?

You can't change anything in an institution that is losing \$8 to \$9 billion every single year. We don't trust the person who heads this, but we are going to give him \$25 billion. Do we need that money? Absolutely not. The post office tells us they have \$15 billion on hand, they have access to a \$10 billion line of credit that will more than take them for a year from now. So we don't need to be spending this money right now. It is a silly, silly bill.

But I want to give my friends some free political advice. They want to pass this bill. They want to get it through the Senate. They want to get it to the President's desk. They want to get it signed. I believe that. If that is true, make it bigger. Do exactly what my friend, the distinguished chairman of the committee said, let's put some stuff in it that we agree on.

The President of the United States says, I think every family in America that makes less than \$75,000 a year needs help right now, they need \$1,200 per adult, \$500 per kid, that would be \$3,400, a one-time payment for a family of four. Attach that to this, it would pass the floor unanimously in a bipartisan fashion and be picked up by the Senate. And the President said, through his chief of staff, I will sign something like that.

You could do something a little bit different. We are all having our schools

open right now all across the country. My friends passed \$100 billion in the HEROES Act for it. The President said, actually, we think it would take about \$105 billion. Put that on this and help every school district in America. But my friends chose not to do that, but if you do, it will pass here, it will pass the Senate, and the President would sign it.

Let's talk about unemployment. The President said, hey, we think the \$600 extra is a little high, but while we are negotiating, by the way, we will keep paying it. My friends on the other side said, no, they can do without the \$600. And then the President said, well, we think \$200 is the right number, but we can go to \$400. Put that on here. Every unemployed person in America would get \$400 a week. Right now, thanks to the Speaker and the minority leader in the United States Senate, they are getting zero. The only help they are getting is from the President who is using Herculean executive orders to try and get them some additional relief.

So this is a joke. This is, as my friend the distinguished Member from Georgia said, a theatrical moment punctuating the two conventions, the Democratic Convention and leading into ours. No legislation is going to happen because my friends aren't serious about legislation.

No money is going to get to the post office because it can't pass the Senate, and the post office doesn't need it anyway. So we are going to have an entertaining couple of hours. Fortunately, it is on a Saturday morning, so I don't think very many Americans are going to waste their time listening to this.

When my friends want to get serious, when they want to negotiate, when they want to move something to the floor, we will be ready.

With that, Madam Speaker, I urge rejection to the rule and rejection of the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would love to spend weeks and weeks discussing this in committee, but the truth is that is what the Trump administration wants, to run out the clock before the November elections. So trust in our democracy is undermined, and they can act like there is some conspiracy if he loses.

I have heard my friends on the other side of the aisle talk about process, but I really question their judgment here. They thought that dealing with cheese was such a national emergency last Congress that they used emergency powers to bring a bill on that topic to the floor during a government shutdown no less.

But today, as seniors can't get life-saving medications and our veterans can't get social security checks, they want to hit pause. Our Postal Service is in chaos. Give me a break.

You know, my friends say they don't know who the Postmaster General is.

Let me tell you who he is. He is like the least qualified candidate for the job. He is a big, mega donor to Donald Trump. And my Republican friends are believing everything Mr. DeJoy says, like claiming there is no mail shutdown.

Well, let me remind them what the Postmaster General wrote in a recent memo that these changes have had: "Unintended consequences that have impacted our overall service levels." Those are his words, Madam Speaker.

He is transforming the Postal Service all right. Transforming it from reliable to chaotic right before an election. So even if you trust Mr. DeJoy, which I do not, even he acknowledges that there is something happening here.

Those on the other side of the aisle cannot have it both ways here. This administration apparently won't lift a finger to fix this problem, but this Congress is acting. And I would respectfully urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us. Help the American people. They should be your priority, not the guy in the White House.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE, Madam Speaker, I rise with a sense of urgency. I rise because the Postal Service is near collapse. I rise in the name of Army Sergeant Retired Boudreau, stage 4 cancer, and Katy, stage 4 breast cancer. These are the desperate people that are feeling the brunt of a collapsed Postal Service. The voices I listen to are the letter carriers who are denied the ability to deliver mail, or the postal workers who have no machines to deliver mail.

H.R. 8015 is an emergency SOS act, Delivering for America. It is crucial that we meet today, not because we are political, because we had to get here as fast as we could to be able to acknowledge that the Postal Service is a crucial lifeline for Americans.

Madam Speaker, I submitted an amendment. I am glad that the Rules Committee moved on a closed rule. This is an emergency. Later on today, I will introduce Protecting Democracy by Securing the Right to Vote, that will allow you to request ballots online, by phone, or mail, and most importantly, setting a 10-business-day mail return time for ballots sent by mail and are postmarked on election day.

Why?

Because as we are working today to ensure that mail ballots are safe and secure under H.R. 8015, we have seniors who are listening to the scare tactics that are being said from the highest office in the land. They are frightened.

Yesterday, I was at the house of a blind senior citizen, she can't get out to vote, she will have to do a mail ballot.

So I rise enthusiastically to support the H.R. 8015 rule because we are in a collapse of the postal system. It is ur-

gent. We need \$25 billion, and we need to do it now. I ask my colleagues to support it, and let it be bipartisan.

Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on the Rule for H.R. 8015, the Delivering For America Act.

I thank Chairman MCGOVERN for the work of the Rules Committee to bring this important measure to the Floor of the House for consideration.

I also thank Chairwoman MALONEY for her leadership in drafting H.R. 8015, which is being debated under the Rule.

I offered an Amendment to improve this very good bill, but it was not included in the Rule for H.R. 8015.

The Jackson Lee Amendment, if it had been included would have ensured that ballots postmarked on or before Election Day would have ten business days following that date to be delivered by the Postal Service to local elections officials to have it counted for the election.

I offered this amendment out of consideration for the nearness of the election and the likelihood that the U.S. Postmaster will not change the policies that have led to the decommissioning of mail sorters and mailboxes, which is slowing down the U.S. Mail.

The job of the United States Postal Service is to receive, process, and deliver the mail without favor or special consideration to anyone.

I applaud the work done in the underlying bill to provide relief to the Postal Service, and I appreciate the desire to narrowly focus the bill only on addressing the issues arising out of intentional efforts to disrupt mail service.

I believe that we must be more aggressive in our approach to protect the election and make sure that Election Day does not become a victim of COVID-19.

I will work with my colleagues to ensure that all available means are provided to ensure that every voter, no matter their party or preference has access to cast a vote that will be counted in the November election.

I support the Rule for this bill because it provides much-needed protection to postal workers and relief for those who are dependent on the mail service for sustaining life and health as well as commercial needs and business.

In 2019, the Postal Service:

Delivered 142.6 billion pieces of mail to 260 million addresses in America;

Delivered 1.2 billion prescriptions, including most of the medications ordered by the VA;

Employed 633,108 of our friends and neighbors, including more than 100,000 veterans;

Served 70 percent of businesses with fewer than ten employees;

Had a 90 percent favorability rating, making it the most popular federal agency.

The Postal Service:

Is often the only delivery option for rural America where service is not profitable;

Delivers 48 percent of the world's mail with one of the world's largest civilian vehicle fleets;

Is a vital service for the more than 18 million seniors who do not use the Internet.

The Postal Service has become a pharmacy of choice for millions of Americans who live in pharmacy deserts—locations where there are no pharmacies to serve communities.

The Postal Service is an essential component to Veterans' health because they deliver medicines to our veterans.

The VA has now confirmed to us that the United States Postal Service (USPS), which is

responsible for delivering about 90 percent of all VA mail order prescriptions, has indeed been delayed in delivering these critical medications by an average of almost 25 percent over the past year, with many locations experiencing much more significant delays.

Under the urgent need to fix the postal service, we must not forget that the Postal Service employees are essential workers in COVID-19, and if they are essential it means that the work they do is essential.

In addition to delivering prescriptions and business mail, they are also delivering democracy to millions of voters who will need to cast their ballot by mail this election year to reduce their risk of contracting COVID-19.

The U.S. mail service has provided essential mail service for absentee voting for well over 100 years by enabling Union troops to vote during the Civil War, World War I, World War II, Korean War, Vietnam War, Iraqi Freedom, and to this day.

Since that time, absentee or not, in-person voting has grown in popularity across the United States and is now a welcomed and valued component for assuring citizen participation in public elections.

In 2016, 20.9 percent of all votes cast in that federal election were done so by absentee ballots and this year that number is expected to be much higher due to COVID-19.

The attack on the viability and value of absentee voting should be viewed as just one component of many assaults on our elections system that may make this a very difficult election year.

This view is shaped by the decades of elections filled with disinformation and misinformation tactics designed to suppress or repress black, LatinX, and young voters from voting or having their votes counted.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in support of the Rule for H.R. 8015.

Mr. WOODALL, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the Rules Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURGESS, Madam Speaker, this bill, H.R. 8015, does seem to be rushed. And here is the biggest thing, it is not going to address the core problem that exists in the United States Postal Service.

This bill appropriates a \$25 billion bailout using emergency supplemental funding, removing it from the previously agreed to bipartisan budget agreement numbers, and prohibits the Postal Service from making any reforms until next year at the earliest.

So if this bill is intended to improve efficiency or effectiveness of the Postal Service, I would just simply ask: How in the world is it supposed to do that if it is prohibited from making any changes?

The Postal Service is in trouble, every Member of this Chamber, Republican or Democrat, understands this. We should be deeply concerned about the precarious position of the Postal Service. But despite the narratives, this problem has been decades in the making.

The Postal Service's operational pains have been festering literally for

decades. Since 2007 mail volumes have fallen year after year as American consumers and businesses have chosen digital communication over letters and mailed advertising. Over the same period, the number of addresses requiring delivery and retirement obligations for retired Postal Service employees have continued to grow. So in very simple terms, revenues have fallen, and costs have risen for over a decade.

□ 1100

This novel coronavirus' impact on the economy is only exacerbating this situation. The Postal Service lost \$2.2 billion in the second quarter of this year. H.R. 8015 kicks the can down the road and forces the Postal Service to continue to sustain financial losses. No reforms to modernize the Postal Service, so we should expect its fiscal health to worsen.

Now, in spite of all the heated rhetoric today, the Postal Service will not collapse tonight. The Postal Service has informed Congress that it has enough cash on hand to remain solvent through August 2021. That is a year from now if you are doing the math at home. And Congress has already provided an additional lifeline by raising the Postal Service's loan authority by \$10 billion.

Instead of voting on this rushed and partisan bill, Members of this Chamber could work together to solve the problem. Congress has time to work through the proper committees, provide the proper oversight, provide the proper reforms, and preserve this essential service.

Let's vote against this bill today, a dictatorial bill brought to us by the Speaker of the House, H.R. 8015, and work together in finding a meaningful and lasting fix for the United States Postal Service.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I have heard some of the Republicans clamor last night in the Rules Committee all about statistics.

Well, let's look at some. This is from the Postal Service's most recent quarterly report. It compares on-time delivery for single-piece first-class mail this fiscal year so far as compared to last fiscal year. Do you see the red line? It is going in the wrong direction. Mail is slowing. People aren't getting deliveries that they need on time. This is just through the end of June. We don't know what truly happened in July or so far in August.

Our constituents are not lying to us. Their mail is delayed. Their medications are delayed.

Yesterday, we were told: You know, people who are on Social Security don't have to worry because they get all their Social Security checks electronically. We know that is not true. We know that close to 1 million people get Social Security and SSI through the mail.

So, this is real. This is happening. And we need to do something about it.

The fact that this is happening in the middle of a pandemic right before an

election, I mean, I don't believe in coincidences. This is deliberate, and it is shocking. As I said before, this is a five-alarm fire on our democracy.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article, "Quit Interfering and Save the Postal Service," by the former chair of the Board of Governors of the Postal Service, David Fineman.

[Aug. 5, 2020]

QUIT INTERFERING AND SAVE THE POSTAL SERVICE

(By S. David Fineman)

The U.S. Postal Service is in trouble and needs help just like the airlines, large and small corporations, and consumers. There are ways to save it if Congress takes action very soon.

Where to start with its problems? The USPS is losing billions because of the pandemic. Its leadership has said running out of money is a question of when, not if. Its board of governors temporarily lost its quorum this year and is now made up only of Trump administration appointees. The president of the United States called the Postal Service a "joke." And now state election officials are warning that reduced mail service could interfere with mail-in ballots in November.

I served as a governor of the United States Postal Service from 1995 through 2005. I was nominated by President Bill Clinton, and served as chairman during the administration of President George W. Bush. By law, the USPS should have nine members on its board, five of one party and four of another. During my tenure, there was never any interference by the president in the business of the USPS, like there is currently.

What is happening now is unprecedented, and we wonder why. Let us hope it is not to disturb the election process and mail-in ballots.

During my first year on the board, it became clear the rate-making process, which decides how much one pays to mail a letter or a package, made no sense. Not until 2004 was there movement on any legislation in Congress. Eventually the chairman of the committee overseeing the Postal Service, Dan Burton (R-Ind.), and the ranking member, Henry Waxman (D-Calif.), agreed on the outline of a bill. The bill, with a few changes, passed the House of Representatives, the Senate, and then was signed into law by Bush in 2006.

One section of that legislation called for the USPS to prefund its pension obligations for 75 years. I remember meeting with the then-postmaster general, and after a thorough briefing, we both concluded the USPS would never have the necessary funds to and maybe naivety, I believed congress would amend the law in due time to eliminate that burden.

So here we are in 2020, in the middle of a pandemic. Congress and the administration cannot agree on how to fix the USPS. Everyone in the so-called postal community, including its unions, agree the prefunding requirement is not needed. Let us get legislation to eliminate the prefunding requirement passed.

What else can be done? First, let us stop the parochial mindset of Congress. The USPS has needed to right-size for some time, and not just close post offices. Because of population shifts, it can consolidate large processing plants, so they can process mail from various states and municipalities.

Last week, Treasury released \$10 billion already allocated to the USPS, with conditions that are at best questionable. It was required to share with Treasury details of contracts it negotiated with Amazon and others. Congress should allocate without any conditions, just like it has bailed out multinational corporations as a result of the pandemic.

If we believe what we hear from the administration and the postmaster general they seem to have two solutions: First, raise the price of packages, although the rate-making process has confirmed the prices set were fair, and within the confines of the law. Second, cut the pay of the unionized workforce, which has already suffered thousands of coronavirus illnesses and, at last count, at least 60 deaths.

If the price of packages is raised, who pays? The consumer and small businesses, not just on packages sent by USPS, but by every private delivery service. That is the reality of how business works, and to deny it is not dealing with reality.

As USPS raises its prices, you can be assured that the private delivery services will raise their prices. Considering the present composition of Congress, the provisions of the law regarding how union contracts are negotiated is not about to change.

With the pandemic, the USPS is needed more than ever before. Small businesses and the average American rely on delivery of mail six days a week. They need to get their checks, their letters, and packages, on time.

The USPS needs help! There is a way to fix it!

The administration must stop holding the USPS hostage to its own private agenda. Rural America and the inner city population would suffer more than anyone else. The solutions are clear. Let us just get it done.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, "I'm writing to you today after having skipped a day of my high blood pressure medication for the first time."

"I have not seen a Postal Service carrier in my neighborhood for a week or more, not received mail for 10 days. The last couple pieces of mail were 30 days late."

"I am a small business owner. I am in a real bind. I usually ship packages to customers. Switching to UPS or FedEx would be too expensive. I would likely lose customers."

These are just a few of the thousands of messages that my office has received from constituents who have been caught in the crosshairs of this administration's war on the U.S. Postal Service.

We are here today to deliver a message to this administration: Don't mess with the USPS.

This vital public service is essential in our everyday lives. In a pandemic, it is a lifeline.

These are the real consequences of this administration's ill-conceived efficiency measures, which have disrupted postal service across the country. Those consequences have made their way to the doorsteps of seniors, veterans, people with disabilities, and countless families and businesses, large and small.

As millions of Americans are expected to vote by mail, many for the first time, we need to give Americans the peace of mind that their mail will be processed swiftly. That is why I am

proud to support the Delivering for America Act.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I say to my friend from Pennsylvania, I want to solve every single one of those problems that she just laid out. Those are absolutely bipartisan concerns. This bill solves none of them.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), another member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

“Nancy Pelosi Goes Politically Postal.” That’s the catchy title of a recent op-ed written by The Wall Street Journal editorial board, and that is the reason we are here today, for phony political theater to once again bash President Trump just in time for the Sunday talk shows and the Republican National Convention. And just like all the other times, the media will lap it right up.

Wouldn’t it be nice if we were here today on a Saturday voting on a negotiated COVID relief package to help the American people that could actually be signed into law? But sadly, instead, we are here talking about a postal bill, one The Wall Street Journal editorial board called a “made-for-TV phony political crisis.” Boy, did they get that right.

Let’s review the facts.

A task force recommends that the U.S. Postal Service overhaul their business model in order to return it to sustainability because expenses have outpaced revenue for 13 straight years, and they lost \$8.8 billion in 2019 alone.

The new Postmaster General is unanimously selected by a bipartisan Board of Governors, not President Trump. The Postmaster General starts making some changes in an attempt to make the post office more sustainable, as recommended by the task force—you know, similar to the types of changes that were made under the Obama administration in the past.

The Postmaster General worries that some States allow voters to request mail-in ballots too close to the election day and is afraid that there is not enough turnaround time for those ballots to get back in time, so he sends a courtesy letter to those States, recommending they tell voters to mail in their ballots early so they can get them in time.

Guess what? Democrats freak out, blame Trump, say he is trying to influence the election, even though Trump doesn’t have control over the Postmaster General, and run to the ever-so-willing media to spread a new Trump conspiracy theory.

Seems insane but all too typical for the Trump-hating Democrats to me.

But don’t take my word for it, let’s see what Stephen Kearney, a 33-year veteran employee, former Treasurer, and Senior Vice President of the U.S. Postal Service said: “This conspiracy theory is the most far-flung thing I think I have ever heard.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me just say again for the RECORD because we hear this on the other side: Wouldn’t it be nice if we were here negotiating a larger package on a whole range of things. Well, we actually passed something in the House called the HEROES Act. The Senate has passed nothing. The reason why is because Republicans are fighting with Republicans. They can’t agree on what to do, so they have done nothing. So, we are negotiating with an empty chair.

If my friends really want to help, they ought to pick up the phone, and they ought to call MITCH MCCONNELL and tell him to do something, to actually do something.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, mail is an essential government service and a critical lifeline for many, especially during this pandemic.

What have operational changes made to the postal system accomplished? Parts of the country are having their mail delayed by up to a week or more. This is harming veterans, seniors, and our rural communities.

What has the Postmaster General already done? Curtailed overtime; restricted deliveries; eliminated sorting machines; in Hartford, Connecticut, in the parking lot there is a dismantled machine; removed mailboxes; prohibiting employees from making late mail deliveries, directing them to leave mail undelivered at distribution centers overnight; warned 46 States and the District of Columbia that it could not guarantee all ballots cast by mail for the November election will arrive in time to be counted.

Yes, this is about our democracy, as well. This administration is undermining a pillar of our democracy, voting for a partisan purpose. Obstructing the Postal Service for political purposes is illegal. It is illegal to interfere with the mail.

During this unprecedented time, we must be streamlining, not sabotaging, voting by mail.

The administration wants to destroy the public’s faith and trust in the public service. No, the American people are not going to let you do it. I might add, the Postal Service has a 90 percent favorability rating. It is the most popular Federal agency. Would that we had a 90 percent favorability rating.

We must fight for this essential component of our democracy and of people’s lives. We will, through rain, shine, or sleet, or President Donald Trump.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), the ranking member of one of the committees that is near and dear to my heart, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, a good friend, and a member of the freshman class of 2010.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend ROB WOODALL for yielding.

When I was a kid, I couldn’t wait for Saturday morning. Saturday morning in our house, my brothers and sisters, we would get up, and we couldn’t wait to watch our favorite cartoons.

Now, decades later, here I am again, on the floor of the House of Representatives, watching a cartoon about the only outcome this debate is going to have today: one of entertainment value, nothing substantive.

The chairman of the Rules Committee called this a five-alarm fire. Now that the Democratic Convention has concluded and the Republican Convention is about to begin, we have a catastrophe.

It is not going to build infrastructure. It is not going to give aid to people suffering from the pandemic. It is not going to fund the government by October 1. It is not going to become law.

Just like the previous attempts, my friends on the other side of the aisle have had to derail a duly-elected President. This, too, will fail. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am sad that the gentleman thinks this is entertaining. We have veterans who are calling our offices whose medications have been delayed getting to them. We have some people on Social Security and on SSI who are worried that their checks are not going to get to them. We have small businesses that are calling to complain.

This is a crisis that this administration produced all on its own. And whether it is designed, as some of us fear, to try to create more chaos around the election—and by the way, this is what Donald Trump said about the money that we have in this bill: “They need that money in order to have the post office work so it can take all of these millions and millions of ballots.”

Did anybody ever think that they would see a President of the United States who would publicly say that he doesn’t want every vote to count? This is outrageous, and I cannot believe that my friends on the other side of the aisle, who I know are getting the same calls we are, are totally fine with doing nothing.

□ 1115

Well, maybe if some of my Republican friends would join with us, it might send a message to the White House that they have to respond, they have to do the right thing.

It is the complicity; it is the indifference that I just can’t understand given what is going on in this country right now.

So we have been complaining about this for weeks—this didn’t just happen this week, but for weeks—but it is now out of control, and we have to do something.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, over the past few weeks, we have seen the reports of decommissioned sorting machines, removal of postboxes, and the cutting back of hours for the U.S. Postal Service employees.

In my district of Sacramento, I have never seen such an outcry, an outrage amongst my neighbors and constituents.

This is serious business. We are feeling the effects of delayed mail delivery and seeing the real-life consequences of these operational changes: Financial documents are late; prescriptions are stuck in transit; and we worry about our future ballots being counted.

That is why this administration's attacks have alarmed so many Americans. We recognize it is about more than just getting letters from A to B. It is about the fabric of our democracy.

The Postmaster General has made his political preferences and business interests no secret. The U.S. Postal Service should not be manipulated as a political or business tool.

Hundreds of millions of Americans across this country rely on the Postal Service for lifesaving medications, Social Security benefits, paychecks, and mail-in ballots. The Delivering for America Act will help ensure that those services continue as needed.

This bill takes critical steps to halt the damage being done, while providing \$25 billion to put the Postal Service back on track.

While the Postmaster has recently claimed that he will halt operational changes until after the election, he has also stated he has no intention of re-commissioning sorting machines and postboxes that have already been shuttered. The damage has already been done, and it is unacceptable.

We must pass the Delivering for America Act to provide emergency funding and put protections in place to support reliable mail delivery for all Americans.

As I said, this is serious business. The post office is important for the fabric of America.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, though this bill is going nowhere, if we defeat the previous question this morning, I will offer an amendment to take up three bills that are partnership bills that can go through the Senate to the President's desk and make a real difference for the American people, dealing with important issues like healthcare, like relief for folks suffering from the COVID economic crisis, and our law enforcement reform activities.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from

Texas (Mr. BURGESS) to speak on one of those provisions.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is a sudden sense of urgency to address the financial stability of the Postal Service, but I would simply ask the body: Where was the sense of urgency from our House Democratic leadership at the start of the pandemic?

Look, I recognized in January this deal over in China was a bad deal, a novel virus, biological behavior not known, not worked out.

The Postal Service's problems did not surface this week. They have been going on for years. But the Postal Service will not go bankrupt tomorrow, and yet we have been called back here to vote on an issue that, quite frankly, is not going to get solved from today's activities.

But I called on the Committee on Energy and Commerce last February to do hearings on this novel coronavirus. My requests were ignored and then subsequently dismissed because we had other important work to do: horse racing, flavored tobacco, ticket stubs—any number of things—other than work on the novel coronavirus.

But we could have provided support in the form of funding for vaccines and testing and more. We have done some of that in the short-term sense, but we could continue to support our Nation's pandemic response in additional ways, which is why I have introduced legislation that aligns with the legislation already existing in the Senate, where we could come together and provide our country with some of the critical resources necessary to fight this novel coronavirus.

Unfortunately, the House Democratic leadership does not acknowledge or seem even to be curious as to whether or not they are up to the task.

So this legislation provides \$29 billion for the Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund to develop additional medical countermeasures and vaccines. A safe and effective vaccine is the strongest arrow in our quiver to help society return to normal.

Importantly, the bill would provide \$2 billion for the Strategic National Stockpile and \$2 billion for the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority for use in developing medical countermeasures.

But you have to ask yourself: The business plan as promulgated by the Speaker of this body, why is it antithetical to that development? Could it be because the nominee of their party this week in a very important speech promised the American people "no miracle is coming"? Is that because you are going to cut off the funding for BARDA? for the Strategic National Stockpile? for research on vaccines?

Look, there are commonsense, bipartisan ways to help our Nation and help our Nation respond to the coronavirus, but House Democratic leadership has turned their backs on the needs of America.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to vote against the previous question. Allow us to debate and pass this measure. It is of critical urgency. Indeed, a miracle could be coming.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a CNBC article, entitled, "Patients Say Post Office Slowdown Is Delaying Delivery of Life-saving Medications."

PATIENTS SAY POST OFFICE SLOWDOWN IS DELAYING DELIVERY OF LIFE-SAVING MEDICATIONS

(By Christina Farr)

The U.S. Postal Service has become a political battleground, and has experienced delays after Postmaster General Louis DeJoy slashed overtime.

Many patients are experiencing delays receiving life-saving medications and are sharing their experiences online via hashtags like #USPSMeds.

Experts say the situation could escalate, despite Postmaster General Louis DeJoy's promise to suspend changes to the Postal Service.

Nathan Geissel, who lives in rural Oregon, has been waiting more than nine days for a lifesaving medication to arrive in the mail. As far as he knows, it's stuck in a fulfillment center.

Geissel's doctor prescribed the medicine two years ago to prevent blood clots. He's never experienced delays before.

The U.S. Postal Service has become a political battleground after President Trump said he opposes additional funding because he doesn't support universal mail-in voting. Postmaster General Louis DeJoy, a Trump supporter, reportedly ordered recent cost-cutting measures, slashing overtime and curbing late delivery. It has created significant delays in mail deliveries, according to mail worker advocates and others.

Americans are sharing stories about medication delays with the hashtag #USPSMeds. Many are veterans who have reported weeks-long delays. Some are seniors who instead have to visit a pharmacy, putting them at higher risk of exposure to Covid-19.

Geissel chose mail-order for the convenience—the nearest pharmacy is 20 minutes away—and the affordability. His insurance company covers more of the cost of the medication when it's delivered by the U.S. postal service. Geissel has to pay a \$135 copay for a months supply if he instead picks it up at a retail pharmacy.

"Thankfully, a local pharmacist approved two more weeks of medication with my health plan that I could pick up as an emergency," said Geissel. "I work in health care, so I know the system, but I can't imagine what it must be like for an elderly patient who doesn't have that same access."

"I'm worried," said Liz Austin by phone. Her mother, Barbara, is sick with cystic fibrosis, a progressive disease that causes lung infections and limits her ability to breathe. "Covid-19 is primarily a respiratory disease, so my mother relies on the mail to get her prescriptions as safely as possible."

Her medicine was so late that her husband had to risk visiting a pharmacy.

After lawsuits from more than 20 state attorneys general and a call to testify before Congress, DeJoy on Tuesday said he's suspending operational changes until after the November election.

Some experts are concerned that the delays will snowball.

"There's an exponential factor to this," said John McHugh, a former congressman who heads up the Package Coalition, an alliance that aims to preserve affordable postal package delivery services. Members of the

Package Coalition include Amazon, eBay, and Cigna's Express Scripts. "Once you are behind, what happens next is you get further behind and then further behind."

The pandemic has strained the mail-order medication system as more people are apt to receive prescriptions at home. Those with pre-existing conditions are at greater risk for hospitalization if they get Covid-19.

"Data show an increase in prescription drugs dispensed through mail-service pharmacy during the pandemic," said a spokesperson from PCMA, a national association representing pharmacy benefits managers, which negotiate prescription drug costs on behalf of insurers.

Online pharmacy Honeybee Health said about 20% of patients who order delivery via first-class mail have experienced delays so far.

"The situation is fluid but it's clear from our customer service team that an usually high number of patients are receiving their medication far later than expected—and in some cases, not receiving it at all. These delays are troubling for everyone, but for patients who rely on medication to live, it's especially dangerous," said Dr. Jessica Nuhavandi, co-founder and lead pharmacist for Honeybee Health, which delivers generic medications via USPS.

Umar Afridi, founder of TruePill, a company that provides pharmacy services to telemedicine companies, said he "estimates that about 90 percent" of prescription drugs his company delivers via mail run through the postal service.

"We tend to use UPS and FedEx more for time-sensitive and expensive drugs," he said. "USPS is often the lowest cost and they have the biggest reach."

Afridi said he hasn't yet heard about delays but knows there are service-level disruptions, including pickups not happening on time.

Pharmacy benefits managers are more optimistic. Express Scripts, a major pharmacy benefit manager, said it was "not experiencing unusual delays." OptumRX (owned by UnitedHealth Group) declined to discuss delays. It said it's working with all major carriers "to help ensure timely shipments of home delivery prescriptions."

Some doctors are concerned for their low-income and elderly patients. Dr. Lakshman Swamy, a Boston-based pulmonologist and critical care doctor, says the situation could be disastrous for asthma patients who rely on Medicaid or don't have insurance. These patients might not be able to negotiate an emergency supply.

Swamy, who also has asthma, said it's common for patients with chronic respiratory conditions to rely on mail-order medications. "You can do rescue therapies for a while, but the strong medications will wear off," he said. "Once you don't get the medications you need, you can quickly fall off the wagon and end up hospitalized."

"Any additional strain will have an impact on patients," he said. "It's inevitable."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I don't know for certain that the Senate will take this bill up, but I fervently hope that they will, because I sure as hell know that we are doing the right thing here in the House.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to just point out, because I have heard these questions raised about the \$25 billion in this bill for the Postal Service: Why are we providing that amount?

Madam Speaker, because that is what the USPS Board of Governors recommended, and this Board is made up of 100 percent of Donald Trump's appointees. So, you know, this is not a number that Democrats made up. It is what his Republican Board of the USPS came up with. So that is why that number is there.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee that has made such a difference for so many Americans, in support of the previous question and legislation that we could bring to the floor that would make a difference to the American people.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that the Paycheck Protection Program has produced impressive results. All across America, PPP loans have supported over 50 million jobs. That is 50 million people who can continue to support themselves and their loved ones. In Ohio's First Congressional District, for example, which I have the honor of representing, the program helped over 200,000 people to stay on the payroll and support their families.

Despite this success, there are small businesses that still need our help. According to a July 27 NFIB survey, almost half of small business borrowers predict that they will need additional capital within the next 6 months.

As ranking member of the House Small Business Committee, I have pushed for targeted bipartisan solutions to make sure that our Nation's smallest firms have a chance to survive, and this Congress has acted. Now it needs to do so again to help those small businesses and their employees.

Unfortunately, the top leadership on the other side of the aisle apparently doesn't feel the urgency to do so and allow a vote on additional help for those small businesses that need it so much.

Let me be clear: Every day that goes by without action jeopardizes America's 30 million small businesses and their employees.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support reopening the Paycheck Protection Program through December 31 and allow businesses that have suffered revenue declines to apply for a second loan.

Madam Speaker, we owe it to America's small businesses to work together for a solution. We ought to be voting on that today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, it is interesting to hear my friend talk about the extension of PPP when he voted against that in the HEROES Act when it came before the full House. Luckily, it passed and it is over in the Senate. We are

waiting for MITCH MCCONNELL to do something.

But I love my friends on the other side of the aisle who come up with all these ideas right now. Most of them were in the HEROES Act.

But if these are so important, where is MITCH MCCONNELL? Where is the United States Senate? They went on vacation. They are gone.

We are here because we have a crisis. We have people who can't get their medications, who can't get their benefit checks. We have a crisis where we have a President who is trying to undermine our elections. So we are here doing our work.

Where is MITCH MCCONNELL? Where is the Senate? How about picking up the phone and calling them to come back and do something for the American people?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, again, if we defeat the previous question, we will bring much-needed legislation to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), a rising star here in the Republican Conference, to talk about that.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, it has been 22 days since the last time this body has met, and in those 22 days that the Speaker has refused to work on real relief packages, people have lost their jobs, small businesses have closed, and Main Streets have suffered. The American people were left with the question: Where are our leaders?

I have begged, the President has begged, and the Senate has begged: Please call the House back into session to work on a bill to help suffering Americans.

Now we are back in Washington for less than 12 hours. It is embarrassing that, while we could be working on vaccine funding, saving small businesses, and justice reform, the Speaker will gavel us out and Americans will once again be wondering: Where are our leaders?

I introduced legislation that will fund better training for police officers, increase the number of body cameras, and fund important grants to police departments that help with community policing, which builds trust and lasting relationships in the communities they serve.

It has been 89 days since George Floyd's tragic death, and in those 89 days, Senator TIM SCOTT and I have put forth legislation to fix and improve our policing. We have begged Democrat leadership to come to the table and address this issue that Americans and our communities have asked for.

Yet, what do we get? Twelve hours in Washington, D.C., and no action on vaccine funding, no action on small business relief, and no action on police reform.

Madam Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question so we can consider

this important bill and get Congress back to work, because a Congress at work is America at work.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman asked: Where are the leaders? We are here. We are doing our job. We are responding to a crisis.

Where is MITCH MCCONNELL? On vacation.

Where is the President? Tweeting more insults.

But we are here doing our job to help deal with this postal crisis, and we also did our job when we passed the HEROES Act.

Where is MITCH MCCONNELL? On vacation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I would like to share with my friend, the chairman, that I have no further speakers remaining, and I am prepared to close when he is.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

□ 1130

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I don't know how many more times I will be on the House floor between now and the end of the year. It is a great honor I have to serve with the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts. I think all the time about all the things we could do together; and, candidly, we have done a lot of great things together. This body, when it acts together, does amazing things.

But an unfortunate thing has happened in politics these days, Madam Speaker. We talk more about the bills that we pass than the changes that we make. My friend from Massachusetts has talked time and time again about a unilaterally drafted bill passed by this House in the spring that purports to address families in need, but that included no Republican input, no partnership, had a veto message from the President, and had no chance of getting through the Senate.

We are here on exactly that same exercise today with this manufactured Postal Service bill. The Postal Service has the money that it needs. I will just tell my friends that President Trump won the mail-in vote in the great State of Georgia. That year I won the mail-in vote 2-1. There is absolutely no effort at voter suppression here. As my friend from Connecticut pointed out earlier, that is illegal. That is off the table.

We are talking about, Is there enough money to fund the Postal Service or not?

My friend from Massachusetts references a supervisor's report from the spring when they thought mail delivery was going to go down in volume. In fact, it has gone up in volume. Revenues are higher than they expected. If the Postal Service faces a revenue shortfall, I commit to my colleagues

we will be there together arm in arm to make that happen. But today, when the Postal Service is sitting on \$15 billion in cash and an unused \$10 billion line of credit, a blank check of another \$25 billion does not solve any of the challenges that you and I know exist or solve any of the problems that all of our constituents have.

Madam Speaker, the frustration you hear from my colleagues on this side of the aisle is that we are back in an emergency session working on language that is going nowhere, that will help no one. We can pound on our chests all we like about all the wonderful things that we think—unilaterally by themselves, without any bipartisan input—Democrats crafted and put in this bill. But we all know from year upon year upon year of painful experience, the only things that get done in this town get done together. In a divided government you cannot bully your way to success, Madam Speaker, you have to partner your way to success.

I know my friend from Massachusetts believes that. That is the kind of leadership style he brings to the committee on which I have the honor of serving. I understand my friends have a job to do today. They need to pass this bill. They are going to do it. It is not going to go anywhere, but they are going to do it.

Madam Speaker, defeat the previous question with me today. Let's move PPP extension, let's move vaccine funding, let's move law enforcement reform, and let's do the political exercise that you brought us here to do. But let's do these things that matter as well.

Madam Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question, and if not that, defeat of the rule.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I have great respect for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle which makes me especially sad to hear some of the comments that we heard here today.

This is a crisis that we are currently facing. We are getting calls from veterans whose medications are being delayed in the mail. We are getting calls from others whose essential benefits are being delayed in the mail. People rely on this stuff. It is important.

Madam Speaker, you have heard the testimonies that have been recounted here on our side of the aisle.

This is an emergency, and on top of that, we have a President who does not want every vote counted in the upcoming election because he believes that if we do count every vote, he will lose.

We are in the middle of a pandemic. More and more people are going to be voting by mail, and this President, rather than trying to make it easier for people to vote and to have their voices be counted, is trying to make it more difficult.

The current Postmaster General is not interested in reforming the Post

Office. He is interested in dismantling it. That is what he has been doing.

The bill that is before us is about more than money, I would say to my colleague from Georgia. It is about undoing all the damage that the current Postmaster has put into place that is resulting in all these delays, all this confusion, and all this chaos. Come on. This is serious business.

I am going to close with this. History is not going to look well on those who just went along to get along with this President while he has done some things that would have been unthinkable in any other administration, Democrat or Republican. The complicity and the indifference are shocking to me. I can't believe it sometimes when I hear people defend the indefensible.

What the President is doing with the Postal Service is indefensible, and everybody needs to be counted on this issue. I ask my Democratic colleagues and I ask my Republican colleagues to support this bill. It is the right thing to do for your constituents. Even if the man in the White House doesn't want it, it is the right thing to do. It is about time people started doing what is right for the people of this country.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1092

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8086) to provide additional appropriations for the public health and social services emergency fund, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 8086, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8087) to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to establish a program for second draw loans and make other modifications to the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the

bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 8087, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8088) to provide funding to law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 8086, H.R. 8087, and H.R. 8088.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 171, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—230

Adams	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Beyer	F.
Allred	Bishop (GA)	Brindisi
Axne	Blumenauer	Brown (MD)
Barragán	Blunt Rochester	Brownley (CA)
Bass	Bonamici	Bustos
Beatty		Butterfield

Carbajal	Horsford	Perlmutter
Cárdenas	Houlahan	Peters
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Peterson
Cartwright	Huffman	Phillips
Case	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Casten (IL)	Jayapal	Pocan
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Porter
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Pressley
Chu, Judy	Johnson (TX)	Price (NC)
Cicilline	Kaptur	Quigley
Cisneros	Keating	Raskin
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Richmond
Clay	Khanna	Rose (NY)
Cleaver	Kildee	Rouda
Clyburn	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Kim	Ruiz
Connolly	Kind	Ruppersberger
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Ryan
Costa	Kuster (NH)	Sánchez
Courtney	Lamb	Sarbanes
Cox (CA)	Langevin	Scanlon
Craig	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Crist	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Crow	Lawrence	Schneider
Cuellar	Lawson (FL)	Schrader
Cunningham	Lee (CA)	Schrier
Davids (KS)	Lee (NV)	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Levin (CA)	Scott, David
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (MI)	Serrano
Dean	Lieu, Ted	Sewell (AL)
DeFazio	Lipinski	Shalala
DeGette	Loeb	Sherman
DeLauro	Loeb	Sherrill
DelBene	Lofgren	Sires
Delgado	Lowenthal	Slotkin
Demings	Lujan	Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier	Luria	Soto
Deutch	Lynch	Spanberger
Dingell	Malinowski	Speier
Doggett	Maloney,	Stanton
Doyle, Michael F.	Carolyn B.	Stevens
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Suozzi
Escobar	Matsui	Swalwell (CA)
Eshoo	McAdams	Takano
Español	McBath	Thompson (CA)
Evans	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Finkenauer	McEachin	Titus
Fletcher	McGovern	Tlaib
Foster	McNerney	Tonko
Frankel	Meeks	Torres (CA)
Fudge	Meng	Torres Small
Gallego	Mfume	(NM)
Garamendi	Moore	Trahan
Garcia (IL)	Morelle	Trone
Garcia (TX)	Moulton	Underwood
Golden	Mucarsel-Powell	Vargas
Gomez	Murphy (FL)	Veasey
Gonzalez (TX)	Nadler	Vela
Gottheimer	Napolitano	Velázquez
Green, Al (TX)	Neal	Visclosky
Grijalva	Neguse	Wasserman
Haaland	Norcross	Schultz
Harder (CA)	O'Halleran	Waters
Hastings	Ocasio-Cortez	Watson Coleman
Hayes	Omar	Welch
Heck	Pallone	Wexton
Higgins (NY)	Panetta	Wild
Himes	Pappas	Wilson (FL)
Horn, Kendra S.	Pascrell	Yarmuth
	Payne	

NAYS—171

Abraham	Calvert	Gaetz
Allen	Carter (GA)	Gallagher
Amash	Carter (TX)	Garcia (CA)
Armstrong	Chabot	Gianforte
Arrington	Cheney	Gibbs
Babin	Cline	Gohmert
Bacon	Cloud	Gonzalez (OH)
Baird	Cole	Gooden
Balderson	Comer	Gosar
Barr	Conaway	Graves (LA)
Bergman	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Biggs	Crenshaw	Green (TN)
Bilirakis	Curtis	Griffith
Bishop (NC)	Davidson (OH)	Grothman
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Guest
Bost	Duncan	Guthrie
Brady	Dunn	Hagedorn
Brooks (AL)	Emmer	Harris
Buchanan	Estes	Hartzler
Buck	Ferguson	Hern, Kevin
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Herrera Beutler
Budd	Fleischmann	Hice (GA)
Burchett	Fortenberry	Hill (AR)
Burgess	Fox (NC)	Hollingsworth
Byrne	Fulcher	Hudson

Huizenga	Moolenaar	Smith (NJ)
Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)	Smucker
Jacobs	Mullin	Staubert
Johnson (OH)	Murphy (NC)	Stefanik
Johnson (SD)	Newhouse	Steil
Jordan	Norman	Stivers
Joyce (OH)	Nunes	Taylor
Joyce (PA)	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)
Katko	Palmer	Tiffany
Keller	Pence	Tipton
Kelly (MS)	Perry	Turner
King (NY)	Posey	Upton
Kinzing	Reed	Van Drew
Kustoff (TN)	Reschenthaler	Wagner
LaHood	Rice (SC)	Walberg
LaMalfa	Riggleman	Walker
Lamborn	Roby	Walorski
Latta	Rodgers (WA)	Waltz
Lesko	Roe, David P.	Watkins
Long	Rogers (AL)	Weber (TX)
Loudermilk	Rogers (KY)	Webster (FL)
Lucas	Rooney (FL)	Wenstrup
Luetkemeyer	Rose, John W.	Westerman
Marshall	Rouzer	Williams
Massie	Rutherford	Wilson (SC)
Mast	Scalise	Wittman
McCarthy	Schweikert	Womack
McCaul	Scott, Austin	Woodall
McClintock	Sensenbrenner	Wright
McKinley	Simpson	Yoho
Miller	Smith (MO)	Young
Mitchell	Smith (NE)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—29

Aderholt	Granger	Olson
Amodel	Graves (GA)	Roy
Banks	Higgins (LA)	Shimkus
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Spano
Collins (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Steube
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Stewart
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Timmons
Flores	McHenry	Walden
Gabbard	Meuser	

□ 1235

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)	Huffman (Kildee)	Peters (Rice)
Barragán (Beyer)	Jayapal (Raskin)	(NY)
Bera (Aguilar)	Johnson (TX)	Peterson (Vela)
Blumenauer	(Jeffries)	Pingree (Clark)
(Beyer)	Kennedy	(MA)
Bonamici	(Deutch)	Porter (Wexton)
(Raskin)	Khanna (Gomez)	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Kind (Beyer)	(Butterfield)
(Clark (MA))	Kirkpatrick	Rooney (FL)
Cárdenas	(Gallego)	(Beyer)
(Gomez)	Kuster (NH)	Roybal-Allard
Case	(Clark (MA))	(McCollum)
(Cartwright)	Lawson (FL)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Clay (Davids	(Evans)	Rush
(KS))	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	(Underwood)
Costa (Cooper)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Sánchez
Davis (CA) (Wild)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	(Aguilar)
DeGette (Blunt	Lowenthal	Schakowsky
Rochester)	(Beyer)	(Kelly (IL))
DelBene (Heck)	Lowey (Tonko)	Schneider
DeSaulnier	McNerney	(Houlahan)
(Matsui)	(Raskin)	Serrano
Doggett (Raskin)	Meng (Clark	(Jeffries)
Engel (Pallone)	(MA))	Sires (Pallone)
Escobar (Garcia	Moore (Beyer)	Speier (Scanlon)
(TX))	Mucarsel-Powell	Thompson (CA)
Foster (Beyer)	(Wasserman	(Kildee)
Frankel (Clark	Schultz)	Titus (Connolly)
(MA))	Nadler (Jeffries)	Visclosky
Garamendi	(Correa)	(Raskin)
Gosar	Omar (Pressley)	Watson Coleman
Gonzalez (TX)	Panetta (Kildee)	(Pallone)
(Gomez)	Pascrell	Welch
Grijalva (Garcia	(Pallone)	(McGovern)
(IL))	Payne	Wilson (FL)
Hastings	(Wasserman	(Hayes)
(Schultz)	Schultz)	
Horsford (Kildee)		

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

MR. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 171, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—230

Adams	Gomez	Omar
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Allred	Gottheimer	Panetta
Axne	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Barragán	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bass	Haaland	Payne
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Perlmutter
Bera	Hastings	Peters
Beyer	Hayes	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Heck	Phillips
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Pocan
Bonamici	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Boyle, Brendan F.	Horsford	Pressley
Brindisi	Houlahan	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Raskin
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jayapal	Richmond
Carbajal	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Carson (IN)	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruiz
Case	Keating	Ruppersberger
Casten (IL)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Sarbanes
Ciциlline	Kilmer	Scanlon
Cisneros	Kim	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kind	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schrier
Clyburn	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Langevin	Scott, David
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Correa	Lawrence	Shalala
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Shalala
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Cox (CA)	Lee (NV)	Sherrill
Craig	Levin (CA)	Sires
Crist	Levin (MI)	Slotkin
Crow	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lipinski	Soto
Cunningham	Loeb sack	Spanberger
Davids (KS)	Lofgren	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Stanton
Davis, Danny K.	Lowey	Stevens
Dean	Luján	Suozzi
DeFazio	Luria	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lynch	Takano
DeLauro	Malinowski	Thompson (CA)
DeBene	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Delgado	Carolyn B.	Titus
Demings	Maloney, Sean	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	Matsui	Tonko
Deutch	McAdams	Torres (CA)
Dingell	McBath	Torres Small
Doggett	McCollum	(NM)
Doyle, Michael F.	McEachin	Trahan
Engel	McGovern	Trone
Escobar	McNerney	Underwood
Eshoo	Meeks	Vargas
Españillat	Meng	Veasey
Evans	Mfume	Vela
Finkenauer	Moore	Velázquez
Fletcher	Morale	Visclosky
Foster	Moulton	Wasserman
Frankel	Mucarsel-Powell	Schultz
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Gallego	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Garamendi	Napolitano	Welch
Garcia (IL)	Neal	Wexton
Garcia (TX)	Neguse	Wild
Golden	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
	O'Halleran	Yarmuth
	Ocasio-Cortez	

NAYS—171

Abraham	Babin	Bergman
Allen	Bacon	Biggs
Amash	Baird	Bilirakis
Armstrong	Balderson	Bishop (NC)
Arrington	Barr	Bishop (UT)

Bost	Hagedorn	Reed
Brady	Harris	Reschenthaler
Brooks (AL)	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Buchanan	Hern, Kevin	Riggleman
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Budd	Hill (AR)	Roe, David P.
Burchett	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Byrne	Huizenga	Rooney (FL)
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Rose, John W.
Carter (GA)	Jacobs	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Chabot	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Cheney	Jordan	Schweikert
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Cloud	Katko	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Keller	Simpson
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Conaway	King (NY)	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Kinzing	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Kustoff (TN)	Smucker
Curtis	LaHood	Staubert
Davidson (OH)	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Steil
DesJarlais	Latta	Stivers
Duncan	Lesko	Taylor
Dunn	Long	Thompson (PA)
Emmer	Loudermilk	Tiffany
Estes	Lucas	Tipton
Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Fitzpatrick	Marshall	Upton
Fleischmann	Massie	Van Drew
Fortenberry	Mast	Wagner
Fox (NC)	McCarthy	Walberg
Fulcher	McCauley	Walker
Gaetz	McClintock	Walorski
Gallagher	McKinley	Waltz
Garcia (CA)	Miller	Watkins
Gianforte	Mitchell	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Moolenaar	Webster (FL)
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Wenstrup
Gonzalez (OH)	Mullin	Westerman
Gooden	Murphy (NC)	Williams
Gosar	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Graves (LA)	Norman	Wittman
Graves (MO)	Nunes	Womack
Green (TN)	Palazzo	Woodall
Griffith	Palmer	Wright
Grothman	Pence	Yoho
Guest	Perry	Young
Guthrie	Posey	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—29

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Olson
Amodei	Higgins (LA)	Roy
Banks	Holding	Shimkus
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (LA)	Spano
Collins (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Steube
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Stewart
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Thornberry
Flores	Marchant	Timmons
Gabbard	McHenry	Walden
Granger	Meuser	

□ 1317

Mrs. MILLER and Mr. VAN DREW changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)	DeBene (Heck)	Horsford (Kildee)
Barragán (Beyer)	DeSaulnier	Huffman (Kildee)
Bera (Aguilar)	(Matsui)	Jayapal (Raskin)
Blumenauer	Doggett (Raskin)	Johnson (TX)
(Beyer)	Engel (Pallone)	(Jeffries)
Bonamici	Escobar (Garcia)	Kennedy
(Raskin)	(TX)	(Deutch)
Brownley (CA)	Foster (Beyer)	Khanna (Gomez)
(Clark (MA))	Frankel (Clark)	Kind (Beyer)
Cárdenas	(MA))	Kirkpatrick
(Gomez)	Garamendi	(Gallego)
Case	(Sherman)	Kuster (NH)
(Cartwright)	Gonzalez (TX)	(Clark (MA))
Clay (Davids	(Gomez)	Lawson (FL)
(KS))	Grijalva (Garcia	(Evans)
Costa (Cooper)	(IL))	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Davis (CA) (Wild)	Hastings	Lipinski (Cooper)
DeGette (Blunt	(Wasserman	Lofgren (Jeffries)
Rochester)	Schultz)	

Lowenthal	Payne	Sánchez
(Beyer)	(Wasserman	(Aguilar)
Lowey (Tonko)	Schultz)	Schakowsky
McNerney	Peters (Rice	(Kelly (IL))
(Raskin)	(NY))	Schneider
Meng (Clark	Peterson (Vela)	(Houlahan)
(MA))	Pingree (Clark	Serrano
Moore (Beyer)	(MA))	(Jeffries)
Mucarsel-Powell	Porter (Wexton)	Sires (Pallone)
(Wasserman	Price (NC)	Speier (Scanlon)
Schultz)	(Butterfield)	Thompson (CA)
Nadler (Jeffries)	Rooney (FL)	(Kildee)
Napolitano	(Beyer)	Titus (Connolly)
(Correa)	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Omar (Pressley)	(McCollum)	(Raskin)
Panetta (Kildee)	Ruiz (Aguilar)	Watson Coleman
Pascarell	Rush	(Pallone)
(Pallone)	(Underwood)	Welch
		(McGovern)
		Wilson (FL)
		(Hayes)

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1334

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.

REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO THE HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to section 4003(e) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Pub. L. 114-255), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee:

Mr. Arien Malec, Oakland, California

COMMUNICATION FROM THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 21, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, pursuant to 42 USC Sec. 300jj-12, I am pleased to appoint the following individual to the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee:

Ms. Cynthia A. Fisher, Newton, Massachusetts

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader.

DELIVERING FOR AMERICA ACT

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1092, I call up the bill (H.R.

8015) to maintain prompt and reliable postal services during the COVID-19 health emergency, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1092, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-61, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 116-480, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 8015

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Delivering for America Act”.

SEC. 2. PROMPT AND RELIABLE POSTAL SERVICE DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—During the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the last day of the COVID-19 public health emergency or January 31, 2021, whichever is later, the United States Postal Service may not implement or approve any change to the operations or the level of service provided by the Postal Service from those in effect on January 1, 2020, that would reduce service performance or impede prompt, reliable, and efficient services, including any of the following actions:

(1) Any change in the nature of postal services which will generally affect service on a nationwide or substantially nationwide basis.

(2) Any revision of service standards.

(3) Any closure or consolidation of any post office or postal facility, or any reduction of such office or facility hours.

(4) Any prohibition or restriction on the use of overtime or overtime pay to Postal Service officers or employees.

(5) Any change that would prevent the Postal Service from meeting its service standards or cause a decline in measurements of performance relative to those service standards.

(6) Any change that would have the effect of delaying deferring, or curtailing mail, allowing for the non-delivery of mail to a delivery route, or increasing the volume of undelivered mail.

(7) Treating election mail as any class of mail other than first-class mail, regardless of whether such treatment requires payment of overtime pay to officers or employees of the Postal Service.

(8) Removing, decommissioning, or any other stoppage of mail sorting machines, other than for routine maintenance.

(9) Removing or eliminating any mail collection box that is available to the public.

(10) Enacting any rule, policy, or standard the purpose or effect of which would delay the delivery of mail to or from a government entity.

(11) Instituting any hiring freeze.

(b) *REVERSAL OF POLICIES HINDERING DELIVERY OF MAIL.*—The United States Postal Service shall reverse any initiative or action that is causing delay in processing or delivery or non-delivery of the mail.

(c) *ELECTION MAIL.*—

(1) *POLICY ON POSTMARKS.*—It shall be the policy of the United States Postal Service to postmark, which shall include any imprinted indicia from the Postal Service that indicates the date of receipt, all election mail processed by the Postal Service.

(2) *SAME-DAY PROCESSING.*—The United States Postal Service shall ensure, to the maximum extent practical, that election mail is processed and cleared from any postal facility or post office on the same day it is received at such a facility or post office.

(d) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section—

(1) the term “COVID-19 public health emergency” means the public health emergency declared by the Secretary of Health and Human Services on January 27, 2020, with respect to the 2019 Novel Coronavirus;

(2) the term “election mail” means mail consisting of—

(A) voter registration application forms, completed voter registration application forms, and voter registration cards or similar materials;

(B) absentee and other mail-in ballot application forms, blank absentee and other mail-in ballots, and completed absentee and other mail-in ballots; and

(C) other materials relating to an election which are mailed by a State or local election official to individuals who are registered to vote in the election; and

(3) the term “government entity” means the Federal Government or any State (as that term is defined in section 311 of title 5, United States Code) or local government and any subdivision thereof.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE POSTAL SERVICE.

There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, for an additional payment to the Postal Service Fund (established under section 2003 of title 39, United States Code), \$25,000,000,000, to remain available until expended. Of the amount appropriated in the previous sentence, \$15,000,000 shall be transferred to “United States Postal Service—Office of Inspector General—Salaries and Expenses”.

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter or otherwise effect the terms and conditions of section 3406 of title 39, United States Code (relating to balloting materials under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act).

SEC. 5. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The amounts provided by this Act are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

(b) *DESIGNATION IN THE SENATE.*—In the Senate, this Act is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4112(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 2 hours, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 8015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Delivering for America Act. I also rise in strong support of the brave postal workers across this Nation who

are continuing to deliver the mail for the American people in the middle of a global pandemic.

The Postal Service is a critical component of America’s infrastructure. It provides a lifeline of medication, supplies, and mail for all Americans, everywhere they live, especially in this time of need.

Earlier this year, the Postal Service asked Congress to help. They asked us for \$25 billion in critical assistance to help navigate through this crisis, just like all these other industries did, businesses and entities that received Federal funds from Congress.

This was not a Democratic request. It came from the Postal Service, and it was supported unanimously by the Board of Governors, all of whom were appointed by President Trump.

In response to this urgent request, the House acted. The House said yes. We acted swiftly to help the Postal Service. We voted to include \$25 billion in the HEROES Act, and we passed it on May 15.

Unfortunately, the President would not agree, and the request has languished for more than 3 months. And now we know why, because the President told us why. He admitted on national television that he was blocking the \$25 billion in order to hobble mail-in voting. That is what he said, and I would like to read it to you.

“They want \$25 billion for the post office. Now they need that money in order to make the post office work, so it can take all of these millions and millions of ballots.”

Regrettably, it does not end there. Now the new Postmaster General is using this lack of funding to justify sweeping and damaging changes to Postal Service operations, and we have seen the results: national headlines about delays of days and weeks in mail, veterans desperately waiting for their medications, sorting machines being ripped out and put in dumpsters.

Yesterday, some of my Republican colleagues argued at the Rules Committee that there are “no delays.” That is right, no delays happening anywhere. They claimed repeatedly that there is no data that proves these delays are real.

But we have eyes, and we have heard accounts from across this Nation, from our districts and every district in this Nation, and we have the Postmaster General himself who admitted yesterday that there are, in fact, delays, that he feels bad about them, and that he is working feverishly to address them.

In addition, this afternoon, we have something else. We have new information. We have received new internal Postal Service documents showing nationwide performance data from July and August, official post office data. These new documents show that the delays we have all heard about are actually far worse than previously expected and told us. And they are across the board. They are across this Nation.

This afternoon, I am making these new documents available to all Members of the House, and I urge you to review them carefully. They will be available on the floor during this debate.

The bill we are considering today is simple. It does two things. First, it provides the \$25 billion the Postal Service requested on a bipartisan basis to help during the coronavirus crisis. Second, it returns delivery standards to the way they were before the Postmaster General recently caused all those delays, which has an impact on the delivery and the ability of Americans to vote by mail.

This is not a partisan issue. It makes absolutely no sense to implement these dramatic changes in the middle of a pandemic less than 3 months before the November elections.

The American people do not want anyone messing with the post office. They certainly do not want it to be politicized. They just want their mail, they want their medicines, and they want their mail-in ballots delivered in a timely way. And that is exactly what our bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act. This is the result of a legislative process only slightly less absurd than the conspiracies, insinuations, and fabrications that gave rise to the purported need for it.

I mean, just this second, the sponsor of the bill says she has data now that we can all receive while we are voting on the bill. I mean, is this data from a whistleblower? We all know their record with whistleblowers.

The process is broken. Regardless, we are here today debating a bill to simultaneously hamstring and bail out the Postal Service. We have had no committee hearings or markups. On Monday, we will hear from the new Postmaster General, after we vote on the bill. It makes no sense. The result is deeply flawed.

Although Dr. Fauci advised that there is no reason Americans cannot vote in person, citizens choosing to vote by mail must have their ballots delivered in a timely manner. The Postmaster General has pledged that is his mission. And on Friday, before the Senate, he pledged ballots would be delivered faster than first-class mail, without rate increases.

I want to turn now and, one by one, debunk the Democrats' conspiracy theories.

First, Democrats claim DeJoy is removing blue collection boxes to sabotage the election. This is an absurd claim. This removal process is routine. The Postal Service has removed 35,000 boxes over the last 10 years. Under President Obama, at least 12,000 mailboxes were removed, and no one cried foul then.

Second, Democrats claim Postmaster DeJoy is removing mail sorters to intentionally slow the mail. These sorters were on track to be removed prior to his appointment and reflect the reality that mail volume is down 33 percent over the past 15 years.

□ 1345

The third Democrat claim is that the Postal Service cannot manage volume resulting from the upcoming election. In 2019, the Postal Service handled an average of 471 million pieces of mail each day. Assuming all 158 million registered voters decided to vote by mail, the total volume of requested and mailed ballots would not exceed a typical day of total USPS mail volume.

Fourth, the Democrats claim the Postmaster General's pilot program and his efforts to reduce excessive overtime were intended to sabotage the election. The Postmaster General testified he never sought to eliminate overtime. Instead, he sought to get postal operations on time so there would be less need to rely on overtime and reduce extra mail truck trips. With overtime costs of \$1.1 billion in 2018 alone, why wouldn't you try to improve on that?

The Fifth Democratic claim is that the Postal Service General Counsel sent letters to the Senate election boards to intimidate and stoke fears. Letters were also sent in May, well before Postmaster DeJoy took over—remember, the Postmaster has only been in office 60 days—saying what the U.S. Postal Service has been saying for years, that some State election boards have deadlines and requirements that simply do not consider the reality of Postal Service operations and logistics constraints.

If a State allows voters to request absentee ballots 1 day before the election, why wouldn't the Postal Service advise there might be a problem.

Sixth, Democrats are acting like any mail delays are new and orchestrated by Postmaster General DeJoy. As I have said time and time again, I have been hearing about postal delays for years. Where there are delays, it makes sense to figure out why, and it makes even more sense to do something to fix them.

And, finally, the false narrative that the Postal Service is running out of money and will cease operations before the election. Currently, the Postal Service has over \$15 billion cash on hand, that's enough to keep it solvent until August 2021, and enough time for us to do the right thing.

Like the Russia hoax and the impeachment sham, the Democrats have manufactured another scandal for political purposes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, first, in response, this is not a Democratic conspiracy theory. Republican officials from across this country, elected and appointed, have expressed their own concerns about postal delays and the President's comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, even during this pandemic with most agencies down, we had not heard complaints from the Postal Service until Louis DeJoy was appointed Postmaster General. On the contrary, the pandemic had not kept our mail from being faithfully delivered.

Almost immediately after DeJoy assumed office, pandemonium broke out. For example, in Ward 8 of my district, there was no mail for 2 weeks. And the District and 46 States have been warned by the Postal Service itself that it cannot guarantee that all mail ballots will arrive in time to be counted.

Mr. DeJoy did not tell the truth at the Senate hearing yesterday. We know that from a July 15 memorandum directing employees explicitly to leave mail behind and to significantly cut overtime. We know that from an August 7 Postal Service action that reassigned 23 top executives with decades of institutional knowledge of postal operations in order to centralize operations. We know and will bring out before this hearing is over today that the Post Office continues to be sabotaged.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), a member of the Education Committee.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during my time in this Chamber I have devoted myself to finding the truth and working toward good governance. That requires gathering the facts and exposing the lies. It is in this light that I rise today to oppose H.R. 8015, the so-called Delivering for America Act.

H.R. 8015 aims to solve a made-up crisis by forcing the Postal Service to double down on the very same activities that have caused it to lose money consistently each year since 2006. Then they give the Postal Service another \$25 billion to lose with no strings attached.

Mr. Speaker, there is no immediate Postal Service crisis. Democrats manufactured this crisis and are using it to create fear and advance their agenda. The Postal Service currently has \$14 billion in cash on hand, which is enough to sustain operations through August of 2021. This comes on top of the fact that the Postal Service has not even touched the \$10 billion loan that Congress extended to it in the recently passed CARES act.

The Postal Service has many long-term problems, but there is no short-term crisis. If Democrats were serious about ensuring the longevity of the Postal Service, we would finally pass bipartisan measures like the Postal Service Reform Act of 2017 that was championed by former Representatives Meadows and Cummings. This bill would enact meaningful reforms, keep mailing costs down, encourage innovation, and not require additional taxpayer bailouts.

Our current Postmaster General DeJoy took the job despite being vilified in public. He was unanimously selected by the bipartisan U.S. Postal Service Board of Governors because the board saw tremendous value in his decades of experience managing and growing a successful nationwide logistics company. He certainly had the qualifications to work with Congress and take on the task of postal reform.

Mr. Speaker, we need long-term solutions to fix the long-term problems of the Postal Service. H.R. 8015 merely aims to score political points on an issue that does not even exist. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, we just heard more of the same on the other side of the aisle, denial and disinformation. And I find it particularly ironic that my friend from North Carolina would cite the unanimous decision of the Board of Governors.

Well, guess what? That same Board of Governors unanimously recommended the \$25 billion you are declining that is in this bill today. It is interesting how we cherry-pick facts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Delivering for America Act.

There is an ongoing and concerted effort to disrupt the timeliness of mail delivery and to erode public confidence in the Postal Service, all leading, if successful, to the largest voter suppression in American history since Jim Crow.

The effort is being directed by the new Postmaster General, Louis DeJoy, a crony and major donor of the President. A President who opposes mail-in voting for everyone apparently but himself and his wife. A President who has called the Postal Service a joke and a scam, and who threatened to veto the CARES Act with \$2 trillion for desperately needed assistance all over this country simply to block this funding.

On August 18, the Postmaster General announced, finally, he put a hold on some of the sweeping operational changes that were not only misguided amid a pandemic, but actually eroded public confidence in America's favorite government agency, the Postal Service.

All in a day's work for someone unqualified and unfit to begin with for the office he now occupies.

By now we should all know better than to take the administration at its word. And despite the Postmaster's reported retreat, the sabotage continues. The Postmaster is still not advocating for additional funding for the Postal Service, despite the recommendation by his own Board of Governors. He is still not committed to using overtime as a tool during the pandemic to compensate for 40,000 postal workers who have had to quarantine or gotten sick.

The Postmaster's announcement didn't commit to reversing the cuts to service and capacity, especially restoring sorting machines that absolutely are critical tools in moving large volumes of mail, especially on the eve of a consequential national election.

That is why this bill would restore the service delivery standards and operations in place before Mr. DeJoy took office.

The Postmaster's announcement didn't include an agenda to support election mail that demonstrates a commitment to helping the Postal Service fulfill its historic role in this upcoming election in a pandemic. That is why this bill will ensure that election mail is prioritized for expedited delivery, as has been the practice in previous years.

The Postmaster's announcement did not explain to the public, whom he serves, how an executive could fail so spectacularly and still keep his job. So we still have work to do because the sabotage continues.

We must restore public confidence in the Postal Service and its ability to support voting by mail during the worst pandemic in 100 years. American democracy demands no less.

That is our history. That is the history Mr. DeJoy ignored, and that is the awesome responsibility he betrayed.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to add, there is no evidence of the charges of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, in March, Speaker PELOSI called me a dangerous nuisance for insisting that at least half of Congress come back to vote on a \$2 trillion bailout bill. This week, she has called Congress into session to vote on a post office bill that is nothing but political posturing.

Now, Speaker PELOSI told us we would probably be back in August to vote on a PPP bill. What she didn't tell us is that the PPP would stand for PELOSI's political posturing.

Let me read a quote from the chief operating officer of the U.S. Postal Service that might explain what is going on. “The decision to consolidate mail processing facilities recognizes the urgent need to reduce the size of the national mail processing network to eliminate costly underutilized infrastructure.” That was the chief operating officer under Obama and Biden. In fact, that is from a press release in 2012 when they announced they were closing nine processing facilities in the State of Kentucky. In fact, they didn't remove the equipment, they locked the doors and turned out the lights and shut it down forever, even in Lexington, Kentucky, our second biggest city in Kentucky. A year earlier they closed down a processing facility in my district, the Obama administration did—Obama/Biden.

I include those press releases in the RECORD.

[Feb. 23, 2012]

KENTUCKY MAIL PROCESSING CLOSINGS ANNOUNCED

KENTUCKIANA DISTRICT—As a result of studies begun five months ago, the Postal Service has made the decision to move all mail processing processing operations from:

Bowling Green, KY Processing and Distribution Facility (P&DF) to the Nashville, TN, Processing and Distribution Center (P&DC).

Campton, KY, Customer Service Mail Processing Center (CSMPC) to the Louisville, KY, P&DC.

Elizabethtown, KY, CSMPC to the Louisville P&DC.

Hazard, KY, CSMPC to the Knoxville, TN, P&DC.

Lexington, KY, P&DC to the Louisville P&DC and the Knoxville P&DC.

London, KY P&DF to the Knoxville P&DC.

Paducah, KY, P&DF to the Evansville, IN, P&DF.

Somerset, KY, CSMPC to the Knoxville P&DC.

Once the transfers are completed, the mail processing operation at the closing sites will cease. There will be no change to any of the retail units, business mail entry units or vehicle maintenance facilities at these locations at this time.

It also has been determined as a result of the study of the Louisville, KY, Annex, that there was no significant opportunity to improve efficiency or service through consolidation of mail processing operations, and no changes will be made at this time.

The Postal Service has experienced a 25 percent decline in First-Class Mail volume since 2006, and receives no tax dollars for its operations, relying instead on the sale of postage, and postal products and services.

“The decision to consolidate mail processing facilities recognizes the urgent need to reduce the size of the national mail processing network to eliminate costly underutilized infrastructure,” said Chief Operating Officer. “Consolidating operations is necessary if the Postal Service is to remain viable to provide mail service to the nation.”

Specific dates have not been set for the transition. Until a specific date has been announced, residential and business mailers will continue to be served through the current facilities.

In December 2011, the Postal Service agreed to impose a moratorium on closing or consolidating post offices and mail processing facilities prior to May 15, 2012, to give Congress and the Administration the opportunity to enact an alternative plan.

This delay was designed to allow Congress sufficient time to enact comprehensive postal legislation. In the meantime, the Postal Service continued all necessary steps required for the review of these facilities, including public notifications, public input meetings and consideration of public comments.

Implementation of this consolidation is contingent upon the outcome of pending rulemaking for a proposal to revise existing service standards. This announcement is provided in advance so that appropriate planning and notification can be made in accordance with existing employee agreements.

A list of mail processing studies and their status is available at usps.com/ourfuturenetwork. Specific information about individual studies, including public meeting summaries and summary briefs, is posted on the website, usps.com/aremailprocessing, as it becomes available.

[Apr. 28, 2011]

ASHLAND MAIL PROCESSING OPERATIONS MOVING TO CHARLESTON, WV

ASHLAND, KY—As a result of a study begun in September 2010, the Postal Service has

made the decision to move mail processing operations from the Ashland Processing and Distribution Facility to the Charleston WV Processing and Distribution Facility.

Kentuckiana District Manager James W. Kiser said, "Given the drastic 20 percent decline in mail volume the Postal Service has experienced since 2007, we must take action to reduce the size of our mail processing network. Consolidating operations and placing our people where we need them is necessary if the Postal Service is to remain viable to provide mail service to the nation."

I understand our employees' concern over this move," Kiser added, "but the consolidation makes sense given the fiscal realities. The Charleston facility has the capacity to handle the additional workload and we can realize significant savings by shifting operations there."

The transition is expected to be completed by January 2012. Some employees may be re-assigned to the Charleston facility or to other vacant positions as a result of the move.

This move will not cause any changes in local mail delivery," said Kiser. "Letters mailed to local addresses will be delivered the next day, the same as before. I am confident the transition will be smooth and transparent to our customers and they will continue to receive the same excellent service they always have."

There will be no change in service standards for 96.3 percent of mail. However, as a result of the consolidation, service to 403-406, 413-414, 417-418, 430-432 and 456 will change from overnight to 2-day. Service to 246-248, 250-253, 258-259 and 261-266 will improve from 2-day to overnight. "The significant cost savings and productivity gains expected from this consolidation were deciding factors in making this very difficult decision," said Kiser.

Full retail services will still be available at the Ashland Post Office.

The Ashland Business Mail Entry Unit will remain open for large volume business mailers. Large volume business mailers will be able to bring their mail to the Ashland Business Mail Entry Unit at 1140 Carter Ave.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, my mail, if I send it to my neighbor, goes to Charleston, West Virginia, before it comes back to Kentucky. Is this part of some vast conspiracy? No. It's part of a decade's long realignment process where the post office is trying to match the needs of the consumers to the post office infrastructure.

These voter suppression conspiracies, who knows what the Democrats will blame next. Last month they were blaming the Census, this month they are blaming the post office, probably next month they will blame Amtrak.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), the chair of the Subcommittee on National Security for the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, I want to rise in strong support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act.

This urgent legislation would reverse the ill-advised changes to mail delivery that the new Postmaster General has implemented to the injury of every American's right to vote, and at a serious peril to our democracy.

In my own district, in the city of Boston and city of Brockton, the Postal Service has removed at least six high-capacity mail sorting machines in the mail facility in South Boston, and two more from the postal processing and distribution center in the city of Brockton, causing a 4- to 5-day delay right now in the city of Brockton.

□ 1400

Why would someone do that 10 days before a congressional primary in Massachusetts in the midst of a pandemic when people are being asked to vote by mail in order to keep themselves safe?

Mr. Speaker, I was elected on 9/11, the day of the terrorist attacks on our country. As horrific as that day was, I feel proud that our Nation came together, as Americans do in difficult times. We mourned our fallen heroes. We tried to comfort their families. And we turned to face our adversary together, Democrat and Republican.

Looking back, I believe our democracy was less in danger then than it is today. I say that for two reasons. First, because we were united then, and we are divided today. And we know who divides us. Secondly, back then, the threat was external. But today, at this moment, the greatest threat to our democracy is the current administration.

I call on my colleagues: Stand together. Stand together and defend democracy. Defend your own constituents' right to vote. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 8015.

Defend democracy. You will miss it when it is gone.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and my friend for yielding.

I would counter by saying the greatest threat to democracy in the country is the current majority in the House of Representatives. What we are doing even right here today, what we are doing right now, we haven't even had a hearing on this.

We are going to have a hearing on Monday for something we are voting on today. Absolute political malpractice is what we are watching right here. Why do we even debate this? Why don't we have a vote and then debate it? That is the same issue as what we are doing right now.

My Democratic friends over here are blaming the President as though he is involved in voter suppression. We want to talk about voter suppression. We want to talk about influencing the vote.

Our own Speaker PELOSI just a little while ago had a press conference in which she was touting, 100 days ago, the HEROES Act passed. What she did not say was what was in the HEROES Act: forbidding States from having voter ID.

We are going to have universal mail-in ballots, no voter ID. We are going to

have ballot harvesting across the country. So, we have no purging of votes. We are just going to send out millions of ballots, among which deceased people are there, folks who have moved, or ballots just being sent out all over the place. There will be no voter IDs required. Yet, all these ballots, somebody is going to vote for them and send them back in. Talk about political malpractice.

The chairwoman herself ought to be the first to stand up and testify of the disaster of her own election that took over 6 weeks or thereabouts to get the results because these mail-in ballots kept coming and coming and coming, thousands of which were thrown out. It opened doors for lawsuits in your own election.

It is just absolute insanity what we are doing here, to me. It is a representation of why people are so disgusted with Washington.

We talk about the delays in the mail service. In April this year, we had a briefing—not a hearing, a briefing—to inform us of the delays that were going to be brought about in the Postal Service due to COVID. Well, that is happening. We have thousands of postal workers who are not working because of COVID.

We also have great delays—would you not agree?—in cities like Portland, like Chicago. Of course, there are incredible delays. People are scared to death to even deliver the mail in cities like this. Here we come to a place like this to bail out the Postal Service with \$25 billion that the Postmaster General himself says they do not need, with \$14 or \$15 billion cash on hand and another \$10 billion waiting, if needed, in the Treasury.

This is absolutely unneeded. Yet, this bill is going to give an additional \$25 billion without any reforms.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in the Rules Committee, the other side kept claiming that there was no data about the slowdown in the mail, absolutely none.

Well, this new report, this data, shows a 10 percent decline in service since July 1 after the new Postmaster General came into office and implemented a slowdown of the mail.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise in support of the Delivering for America Act. The post office is a lifeline to rural communities. More than 1,000 people in the district that I serve have written to my office desperate to save the Postal Service: a disabled veteran who depends on the post office to deliver lifesaving medication; a small business owner who needs the post office to deliver her products in an efficient and cost-effective way, so she can feed her family; seniors who must self-

isolate because they are at high risk, who depend on the Postal Service for the supplies they need each and every day.

The Postal Service is more than a service; it is part of who we are. For Joseph in Peoria, he was a child waiting for that decoder ring to come through the mail. For Heather in Pekin, it is a care package full of old family photos after losing a loved one. For Joseph in Kewanee, it is a letter from his best friend serving in Afghanistan.

Birth certificates, college acceptance letters, the mortgage paid off, the Postal Service delivers the American Dream. We cannot let it fail.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), the chief deputy whip.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish my mother a happy birthday. Happy birthday, mom. I wish I were there to celebrate with you. But instead, I am in D.C., voting on a senseless bill that was designed strictly for political purposes and will put your beloved grandchildren further into debt.

Now, I have watched my colleagues on the other side of the aisle come up with some intellectually dishonest stuff in the past. I have seen it happen more times than I care to count, but this effort takes the cake. Just look at what Postmaster General DeJoy said when he testified before the Senate last week and clearly addressed the litany of baseless claims.

First of all, he stated that no reforms would be implemented between now and the election. Overtime will not be cut between now and November. And the very thing the USPS needs more than anything else, reform, is going to be delayed.

He said the removal of the drop boxes will cease, something that I remember well because it happened when I was mayor of my hometown of West Point, Georgia, and our town was furious about it then. I just wish my colleagues on the other side of the aisle had found religion about this issue back then instead of sitting up here fighting over what color to paint the fire hydrants while Rome burned.

This bill calls for 25 billion additional dollars. The postmaster has already testified there is over \$13 billion cash on hand, another \$10 billion in loans they won't need.

I want someone to explain to me how you are going to spend \$25 billion between now and November. We know how this place works. On an unauthorized appropriation, we all know that before you spend money here, you have to have a plan, and I haven't seen one. Then, that plan has to be reviewed and then commented on and reviewed again. Then one more time, it probably has to be reviewed. Then, there is the whole procurement process, bid process on equipment, background checks on new employees, the lawsuits on the

procurement process because the special interest group said that they weren't notified in time so they could get preferential treatment on the government contract. And surely, there will be the customary environmental review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CISNEROS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, surely there will be the customary environmental review to understand the impact on the spotted blue tail south Georgia armadillo being run over by all the new mail trucks.

This bill is a sham. It is a shame. It is not needed right now. We are piling up money. We might as well put it on The National Mall, have a bonfire, invite Americans to bring their lawn chairs and a cooler of beer to watch the bonfire, so they can see firsthand how this place wastes money.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The other side of the aisle has a double standard. Congress provided hundreds of billions of dollars to all sorts of industries, businesses, large and small entities across the country to help them cope with the coronavirus crisis. We did not require them to come forward with detailed plans of how they are going to spend their money. But they want it for the Postal Service.

Now, the Postal Service made a public request, and they requested it and presented it to the Board of Governors, who are appointed by President Trump, and the Board approved it unanimously. That is far more than all these other entities that we have given billions of dollars to did. And we should support the Postal Service now.

On top of it, the CBO came out with an estimate that this money would be spent in the next fiscal year, and that they needed it. The CBO record can be found online.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I heard someone on the other side said something that disturbed me, so it has actually taken me off my remarks because it can't go unaddressed.

For the gentleman to say that Democrats, the majority party here in the House, are the greatest threat to American democracy that the world has ever known, that means we are more threatening than Putin and the Russians, more threatening than this terrible pandemic around us. It is the sort of thing that I would admonish my side never to say about the other side, and it is the sort of thing that I think takes us away from why we are here.

We are here to have debate and discussion and to reasonably disagree on

things. At the end of the day, we are calling for a vote as we normally do. Things are voted up; things are voted down. That has been the process that I have come to know over all these years.

We are here because Americans who are Democrats and Republicans and independents are not getting their mail on time. We are here because there has been a 10 percent slowdown in the last 66 days. We are here because sorting machines have been dismantled at an accelerated rate, not the normal rate, an accelerated rate all across America.

We are here because mailboxes, without density studies, are being snatched. They have been removed over the years, but it has accelerated. It has accelerated to such an extent that now people are wondering: Where is their medication? Where is their check?

It is veterans. It is our small businesses that are hampered by this. It is senior citizens. So, we are not here mysteriously on a Saturday to point fingers and to call names.

The other side has a right to disagree, but this is a problem. I don't know about your constituents, but all of mine are telling me that they can't get their mail on time. They expect more. If the first Postmaster General looked back at this day, I am sure Ben Franklin would be spinning in his grave.

We have an issue before us. We ought to go at it with vigorous debate. At the end of the day, I may lose and you may win, or I may win and you may lose, but the American public loses without us standing up for this issue.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, obviously the last speaker, the gentleman from Maryland, missed the part where one of his Members proclaimed that the President was the greatest threat to democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform's National Security Subcommittee.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is a very interesting debate today. I think it would be a good debate to be reviewed by every political science class in the country as we analyze how Congress has spent us to a \$25 trillion debt.

We have a situation today in which the U.S. Postal Service is sitting on \$15 billion. They have the right to borrow \$10 billion from a stimulus package bill we passed earlier. They are making more money this year than last year because deliveries of packages are up. But despite all these numbers, the majority party has decided to spend an additional \$25 billion.

Now, I like the post office. I really do. But when you have an agency that can spend \$25 billion that is unspent right now, \$24 billion, and you introduce a bill to say they need another \$25 billion, and if you don't vote for that \$25 billion bill, it means you don't want children to get little toys they are

going receive in the mail, or it means that we don't like the post office, that is outlandish.

□ 1415

There are other things we can look at as well.

They talk about getting rid of post offices. In the first 3 years in which President Trump has complete control of the administration, they will be getting rid of less post office boxes than Obama from 2013 to 2016—I don't have the numbers before 2013; it might be 4 years in a row—in the greatest year in which President Trump got rid of mailboxes.

Another thing to point out is, even if every single person in this country votes absentee, which they won't, it would only increase mail that month by 1½ percent. So we have no crisis here. It is something they will easily be able to handle.

The idea that we are even talking about spending another \$25 billion today is indicative of why this country is going to wind up spending itself into oblivion.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the distinguished chair of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chair for yielding and for her tremendous leadership.

The post office is as American as motherhood, baseball, and apple pie. It is one of the only entities actually mentioned in the United States Constitution. It has been around for hundreds of years. The first Postmaster General was Dr. Ben Franklin. It is part of the heart and soul of this country, and the attacks on the post office by the Trump administration are shameful.

The American people deserve a Postal Service that delivers Social Security checks to senior citizens, delivers medicine to disabled veterans, delivers unemployment insurance checks to displaced Americans, and, yes, delivers ballots to those who choose to vote by mail in the midst of a deadly pandemic, because no American should ever have to choose between their health, safety, and well-being on the one hand and the constitutional right to vote on the other.

This is why we need a fully functional Postal Service. Don't mess with USPS.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 43½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD), another Oversight and Reform Committee ranking member.

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. COMER for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you will never hear me complain about having to come to Washington to vote. After all, it is an

honor to serve the people of this great Nation and our constitutional obligation to be here present to vote on the issues facing America.

So the question today is: Are there issues that need to be addressed in the United States Postal Service?

There certainly are. We all know that there are. After all, the USPS has been on the Government Accountability's High Risk List since the beginning of the Obama-Biden administration.

The systemic issues are not new. They did not creep up all of a sudden in the last few weeks since the new Postmaster has been in office. They have been here for awhile. So, if we are really trying to address the issues, there is room for discussion.

The late Chairman Elijah Cummings and the now White House Chief of Staff MARK MEADOWS have a bill that has some serious effort put into it.

Tomorrow we will be having a hearing with the Postmaster to discuss the bill we are arguing today and voting on.

The White House has offered a \$10 billion package, which the Speaker has rejected.

So there are options if we want to address the real issues, but today is not about a serious effort. Today's effort is yet another smokescreen, another conspiracy theory forced upon the American people to distract us from the real problems facing the American people; to distract from the Speaker's unwillingness to work with the White House to protect schools, hospitals, and small businesses; to extend PPP to mom-and-pop businesses that are on the brink and the families connected to them; to address the heartbreaking violence and destruction in our cities and streets.

The American people are tired of this, tired of lurching from one manufactured crisis to another, tired of leadership by fear-mongering, tired of this House preferring to campaign on issues rather than to fix them.

The bill offered today will not save the USPS or provide for long-term sustainability. Today's effort is another attempt to mask the fact that this House under this leadership is doing very little for the American people.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), another member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise to support the Delivering for America Act, to protect a pillar of our democracy and fortify a lifeline so many Americans count on.

This bill would provide urgently needed Postal Service funding and bar its leaders from compromising its services during this COVID-19 crisis.

We all know the motto: "Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the

swift completion of their appointed rounds." But, of course, no one foresaw that any American President would willingly crowbar our mail system to sway an election. So the Delivering for America Act will safeguard our democracy from any Presidential subversion.

This legislation will also allow our mail carriers to do their job by ensuring overtime and proper equipment are available.

It will make sure intentional service delays are avoided so our seniors get their Social Security checks and prescriptions.

It defends our veterans, who count on this noble occupation for work and rely on the postal system to deliver their medicine.

My State, Florida, just completed a primary where nearly 60 percent of the counted ballots arrived by mail. Savvy seniors and residents reeling from a summer of viral outbreaks wanted the safety that only mail-in balloting provided.

This year, our country saw half a million primary ballots rejected, and a main reason they get tossed is due to postal delays.

These brave frontline workers are delivering goods amid a pandemic, and it has taken its toll on their workforce. So in a State like Florida, known for its razor-thin Presidential elections, we can't afford to have 59 sorting machines left on the sidelines.

Blocking postal employees from overtime is not an option, especially when it may hold up hundreds of ballots that decide the Presidency.

The Delivering for America Act helps defend our democracy from the hypocrisy of a President who casts mail-in ballots himself one day, then tries to meddle in our neighbor's mailbox the next.

Don't mess with the USPS. Pass this good bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, that ship has sailed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), another great member of the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, once again, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are pulling the wool over the American people's eyes.

We are here today not to debate or conduct public policy for the benefit of the Nation; we are here so they can perform in political theater. If you have any doubt about that, this coming Monday, the Oversight and Reform Committee is having a hearing with the Postmaster General about this same issue.

So we are voting first, then we are having hearings? I think that is you-know-what backwards.

My colleagues on the left are faking outrage over a made-up crisis to score points during an election. The United

States Postal Service is under no greater stress than it was before the coronavirus pandemic and well before this election cycle.

The facts have been laid out by experts, by independent journalists, by regular citizens who do the job the mainstream media refuses to do. Rather than find out and report what is really going on, we have mainstream media parroting Speaker PELOSI's conspiracy theory.

Here are the facts:

The post office is solvent through most of 2021 and will be able to operate for the 2020 election. They have \$15 billion cash on hand. They have a \$10 billion line of credit they have not used.

If every single American voted by mail this cycle, it would be as low as one-quarter of the mail the post office handles daily.

We have heard a lot about the sorting machines. First-class mail has really tapered off and the volume of packages has increased, so that is an efficiency standard that is doing better.

During the 5-year span of the Obama administration, 14,000 blue collection boxes were removed from the streets.

Twice during election years, the Obama administration proposed funding cuts to the Postal Service. Where was the outrage then? There was none.

Removing and relocating collection boxes where they are more useful is common sense, not a conspiracy.

Postmaster DeJoy testified and has come out publicly saying they are not going to do any more cost-cutting measures before the election, so everything is frozen.

What the other side really wants is universal mail voting, not absentee voting, which we all support. They want universal mail voting. We just mail out ballots to anybody, and who knows who they will be. All that is going to do is sow the seeds, if the election doesn't go their way, to create more chaos and more division in this country.

You won't hear any of these facts from the mainstream media.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides funding that is already there. Creating and peddling this conspiracy theory is irresponsible and reckless. At a time when Russia and China are meddling in our elections, we don't need help from Congress peddling fake news.

This is one bill that needs to be labeled, "Return to sender."

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the distinguished chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, see this mask? What does it say? "United States Postal Service." Not "business"; "service."

For every American, no matter how remote they live, they can get mail. They can get their prescriptions. They can have a small business in Powers, Oregon, pretty remote from everything, and use the Postal Service.

Now, you can't have it both ways, guys. You say the Postal Service doesn't have a problem. Well, wait a minute. DeJoy is making these cuts because he says it has a revenue problem. He has prohibited overtime because they have a revenue problem. They can't move their delivery vehicle more than four times on a route. Eight-mile-long route, you are going to walk 2 miles each way.

Guess what? Mail is getting delayed all across the country.

The fact is, before the pandemic, they were breaking even or making money if we did away with the stupid prefunding of 75 years of healthcare that was put in in the dark of the night by the Bush administration in a lame-duck Congress, and 309 people in this House, including 87 Republicans, voted for that in February, but it hasn't happened.

So you can't have it both ways.

But there is no doubt that the mail is being delayed. I am hearing it from everywhere.

Ms. Lorey, she cares for a blind elderly veteran: I ordered the VA refills for him. They were so late arriving, we had to ration out his most important medication from two pills a day to one pill a day until the prescription arrived.

Ms. Trudy, Eugene, Oregon: My husband is a Vietnam war veteran. His meds are delivered by mail. I love my husband. I want him to get the meds he needs to survive.

Last year, the Postal Service delivered 125 million VA prescriptions on time, but somehow, with the efficiency measures and the cuts—which I guess they don't need to make, but he is making because of the financial crisis—they can't deliver VA meds on time. They can't deliver prescription drugs for seniors and many other Americans who are required by their insurance plan to get their meds through the mail with just-in-time delivery, which isn't happening.

You cannot deny those things.

Why are they happening? How are you going to fix it?

You are up here blathering about all sorts of crap. Talk about how we are going to restore this Postal Service in the United States of America to efficiency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), another great member of the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to apologize to the American taxpayers for this total sham of a process that the Democrats and this leadership are trying to spread. They con-

tinue to have Trump derangement syndrome.

Here are the questions I would ask my Democrat colleagues:

If the Democrats are so concerned, then why have we not had a hearing about the Postal Service issues since June 15 of 2019?

If the Democrats are so concerned, why have we not had round-the-clock meetings to discuss the bill that we intend to fund at \$25 billion which is being proposed?

We have been out of session for 17 percent of the time since March 15. Why haven't we been called back in to discuss this?

If you do the math, on \$25 billion, and we have got 70 days left, that is roughly \$325 million per day.

You tell the American taxpayer where you are spending that money. You tell the American taxpayer how we are going to come up with it. You tell the American taxpayer this is like dropping money from a helicopter.

If the Democrats are so concerned about the post office, why are we having to vote today when the Postmaster General is appearing at the hearing on Monday? This is just like determining the score of a football game and then playing the game on Monday. It makes no sense.

□ 1430

The Democrats have no interest in hearing the testimony of Mr. DeJoy. The only thing they want to do is berate and not give the Postmaster General the opportunity to answer, just like they did Attorney General Barr, which was a disgrace to this country. The taxpayers deserve better.

The Democrats will have no discussion on the spying of the President since 2016.

The Democrats have no explanation of a failed Mueller Report.

The Democrats have no explanation for the impeachment of the President.

The post office will fail as well.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct for the RECORD that the Committee on Oversight and Reform had a briefing on postal on April 9, 2020—right after the COVID crisis struck us—with the Postmaster General.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY), who is another great member of the committee.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I stand with my colleagues today shocked and dismayed by the actions of this administration.

For the past few years, the Oversight and Reform Committee has worked in a bipartisan fashion to modernize the Postal Service with former Representative MARK MEADOWS leading the charge.

Now, like too many things over the past 3½ years, mail has become a partisan issue. The Postal Service is a pillar of our democracy. It is essential for providing critical services such as: lifesaving prescriptions, Social Security

benefits, paychecks, tax returns, letters home from military families, and absentee ballots to millions of Americans.

The VA delivers prescriptions to 80 percent of our veterans via the mail. This intentional and ridiculous slowdown means vets are skipping doses while checking empty mailboxes.

While I was back home, one of my businesses told me they hadn't received mail for 10 days. Another person told me they received mail every other day.

This cannot go on, and we cannot trust the word of a Postmaster General who is unqualified and whose sweeping operational changes degrade the Postal Service, delay the mail, and threaten our upcoming election. We must pass the Delivering for America Act so we can return the United States post office to normal and ensure we have a safe election where everyone is counted.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Chair, I have to comment on what the chairwoman said about the briefings. A briefing is not a committee hearing. With a briefing, there are no notice requirements. Oftentimes in the beginning we weren't allowed to have witnesses, and there are no transcripts. So there is a big difference between a briefing and a committee hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), who is another member of the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the need for meaningful, long-term reform for the United States Postal Service.

The USPS provides an essential service to every community in the Nation, yet this agency has lost \$78 billion in the last 13 years. In 2009 the Government Accountability Office published a report placing USPS on the high-risk list, doubting the self-sustaining financial viability of this agency. The financial state of the USPS has progressively worsened due to declining mail volume, liabilities, and debt. Proposals to give the USPS \$25 billion in cash without serious reforms will not address the fundamental issues that the agency faces.

The proposals before us today only delay real reform and throw taxpayer dollars at a problem with no clear vision forward. Rather than politicizing the mail, we should be working to give the USPS longevity through comprehensive reforms. Rather than trying to fix a problem by simply spending more taxpayer money, we should be enacting reforms to equip our Nation's outstanding postal workers with the tools they need and deserve to continue delivering the mail. This is the only way we will ensure that Americans continue to receive this vital service without interruption.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), who is another outstanding member of the committee.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, today we vote on a bill that would block an attack on the U.S. Postal Service. By doing so we are blocking an attack on an American institution, on our American way of life, and on democracy. By responding to the unanimous requests of the Trump-appointed Board of Governors of the Postal Service for a funding of \$25 billion and restoring operations to January 1 levels, we will literally be saving lives.

The necessity of this vote and the necessity of this legislation shows the peril to our democracy that this administration has placed us all in, our elders, our veterans, our businesses, and our vote.

We will go further than just voting, and we will have that hearing on Monday on the Oversight and Reform Committee led by Chairwoman MALONEY to speak with the Postmaster General to examine some of his, shall we say, creative decisions.

We want to examine the operational and organizational changes at the Postal Service that have resulted in delivery delays across the country, including the delays of goods and services for small businesses and families, as well as critical medicines.

In my district of the Virgin Islands we are hostage to the U.S. Postal Service. We cannot drive to big-box stores, never mind medicines for our elders or our veterans.

We will review the impact of these changes on the rights of eligible Americans to cast their vote through the mail in the November elections, but we will also have a few closing questions for Mr. DeJoy.

Is Mr. DeJoy thinking about that senior who won't receive their medicine on time due to his policies?

Has he thought about the veteran who served our Nation and can't get their prescriptions to heal?

Has he considered rural Americans who have to drive 20 miles to the nearest post office?

Has he thought about any of these people?

Or is he, like the President, only concerned about his own self-interest?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. COMER. That ship has sailed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG) who is another valuable member.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, if there is a bill that more accurately reflects the failure of Democratic leadership for my first 2 years in Congress, I don't know what it is.

I know that because I came to Congress knowing of the problems with the Postal Service. I am the only Republican on the Oversight and Reform Committee who cosponsored the Democrats' bill to remove the prefunding of their pensions. I have been working on this, been curious about it, and have cared about it for a very long time.

I supported former Chairman Cummings' and MARK MEADOWS' bipartisan solution for the Postal Service because I represent a rural State, and privatization is bad for my constituents.

But do you know how important this has been to the Oversight and Reform Committee?

Our last hearing on the Postal Service was in April of 2019. But somehow, we have decided that because the previous Postmaster General who was appointed in 2015 and didn't resign until June and did something unique in this town—made sure just about everybody hated her.

But now we are saying this all blew up last week. But it didn't. I know it didn't because you can Google postal problems in any jurisdiction from one end of this country to the other and you know they have existed before.

But instead we will come to the floor, debate a bill offered and sponsored by the chair of the committee of jurisdiction, we will vote on it today, and then we will have a hearing on Monday about the bill. So before we even talk about the fact that we are giving \$25 billion to an organization that already has \$25 billion cash on hand, and regardless of how you feel about this, \$25 billion does not deliver votes, and we have no ability to do this.

We are doing this in a way that is completely and utterly political theater because anybody who has been paying attention knows that the post office problems are chronic, they are not acute. They have lost \$70 billion since 2007, and they lost \$9 billion in 2019.

So my question is: Why haven't we been having hearings on this in the Committee on Oversight and Reform for the 2 years I have been here?

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the gentleman's statement that the money is not needed. The Postal Service sought the \$25 billion from Congress to provide this critical relief, and that request was supported unanimously by a vote by the Board of Governors who were all appointed by President Trump.

Yesterday we received the report from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, and that report estimates that the vast majority of this funding would, in fact, be needed within fiscal year 2021 to provide services to the American people.

This should be a nonpartisan issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS). My good friend is the distinguished chairwoman of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ran to the floor when I heard that our Members on the Republican side of the aisle are trying to use as an excuse we have not had a hearing. Oh, yes. You have had a hearing. You have had a hearing from the American people who are shocked that the President and DeJoy are out there dismantling and destroying our Postal Service.

For 3 years I warned the American people and my colleagues that this President was a threat to our democracy. Yet, here we are today voting on a measure to save the Postal Service because it is being sabotaged by a desperate President in order to cheat in the 2020 elections.

Since our country's founding, the people have relied on the Postal Service for everything from delivery of letters to our seniors wanting their medicines delivered on time. Veterans want their disability checks on time. Social Security recipients want and need their money.

So I want to say to the Members on the opposite side of the aisle: You had better get some courage. If you are afraid of the President, you had better step up to the plate on this. We will not allow the United States Postal Service to be destroyed by you.

And another message to the President: Stop removing our blue mailboxes from our neighborhoods.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, Ms. WATERS forgets that President Obama removed 12,000 of those blue boxes that she just asked that they quit removing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of frontline, essential rural mail carriers and postal workers across my district and America who have continued to go to work and do their jobs during the pandemic. This is in sharp contrast to many of my colleagues across the aisle who draw a paycheck but don't show up to vote or do their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I also stand in opposition to H.R. 8015 because it is a sham bill that has no future. It doesn't belong on this floor. It belongs in the archives at the election hoax of the month club.

How do the Democrats keep a straight face while proposing a \$25 billion bailout disguised as election integrity when it would equal about \$200 per ballot if every voter voted by mail?

That is preposterous.

With its current over \$14 billion cash on hand and access to \$10 billion from the CARES Act, do we even have to keep explaining that the United States Postal Service is in a more than adequate financial position to remain fully functional well beyond the election?

No. The American people are smarter than Democrats give us credit. I believe most see past the smoke and mirrors. The post office is important. It is not going anywhere, and this bill has nothing to do with a fair election.

The ranking member and I participated in a youth organization, and at the beginning of each meeting the leader would ask: Why are we here?

Many of us are asking that question today: Why are we here?

The answer is because this House is adrift. This House is a ship without a rudder. It lacks vision, it lacks direction, and, most importantly, it lacks leadership. It simply gets tossed to and fro by the political wind of the day.

Mr. Speaker, it didn't just start. It has been that way this whole Congress. At a time when America has legitimate needs with a pandemic and an economy trying to get back on track, it is really no surprise that this is the best the left can do. House Democrats offer no hope. We need change.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Why are we here?

We are here because the President of the United States went on national television on Thursday night and said he was going to defund the post office. That is why we are here.

Further, he said he didn't support mail-in voting when we know that millions of Americans will want to vote, for health reasons, by mail. That is why we are here.

We are here because we wrote numerous letters to the Postmaster General, which he ignored. That is why we are here.

I applaud the Democratic leadership for calling us in for this emergency meeting to make sure that the post office is funded. It was funded before we even had a Constitution. It is one of the pillars of our democracy. It is enshrined in our Constitution, and it provides vital services to Americans who need medication, the ability to conduct business, and to stay in touch. It binds us together as a nation. Most of us do not like the fact that the President of our country would even mention defunding the post office. That is why we are here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE), a very distinguished member of the committee who brings valuable experience to us as a former member of the Postal Service.

□ 1445

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8015. This is essential legislation to offset the dangerous actions taken by the Postmaster General over the last 2 months.

We are here today, in addition to that, to fund the Postal Service. For more than two centuries, the United States Postal Service has delivered mail to every house in America across this country—every single home. It is the only Federal organization that touches every American every single day, 6 days a week, confirming that it is an essential government service.

Today, the current administration and the new Postmaster General seem to struggle to understand that the Postal Service is an essential government service authorized by the Con-

stitution. It is not a business to fund the bottom line.

In just the first 2 months of his tenure, without having any postal experience, this Postmaster General has threatened and has taken actions to undermine decades of precedence within the Postal Service.

Today, Congress must act. As my chairwoman said, that is why we are here. We must act. The Delivering for America Act does just that. Along with providing the Postal Service with a desperately needed \$25 billion to offset revenue that has been forgone due to COVID-19, it also—and this is something that is very important—this legislation prohibits the Postmaster General from making any operational changes that will undermine the Postal Service's ability to fulfill its mission.

Its mission is to deliver the mail. Rain, sleet, snow, gloom of night, the Postal Service will deliver the mail.

Mr. Speaker, we have a Postmaster General who has come inside and tried to rip it apart from the inside. We will say: Cease and desist.

In addition to us having the goal of the Postal Service to deliver the mail, our democracy is hinging upon them doing that basic job.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to say that the money was asked for by the Board of Governors—which, by the way, is appointed by the President, and which, by the way, are all Republicans who asked for that money to be appropriated. The Postmaster General approved and said he needed that money as well.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for bringing this critical legislation to the floor. I thank the chairwoman for including the language that will prohibit the enactment of any rule or standard or policy with the intent to delay the mail from our government.

We have a real responsibility here today. There is not a Member on either side of the aisle who has not received a letter from our constituents. Let's do our job.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I have the most respect for my friend, the chairwoman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform, but I believe she misspoke.

She said the President wanted to defund the Postal Service. That is not what the President wants to do. The only time I have heard the word "defund" lately was by the liberal progressive wing of the majority party that wants to defund the police.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, we are here today because my Democratic colleagues have created a conspiratorial crisis out of thin air in another attempt to dupe Americans with an election hoax. Only this time, instead of Russia, it is the United States Postal Service.

Democrats are intentionally misleading people to believe that the operational changes at the Postal Service,

including the removal of mailboxes and antiquated processing equipment, just started. That is a lie. Nonetheless, Postal Service officials have confirmed that these operational changes, some of which were agreed to by Democrat Members, have already been halted until after the election.

In regard to the delay and delivery of mail over the last few weeks, the national number cited may well reflect delays in cities that have been under siege by anarchists. I will direct my colleagues and the American people's attention to these photos of the burned-out post office in Minneapolis. There is no way to know how many letters to loved ones were lost, or birthday cards or gifts or family heirlooms or that decoder ring that that kid had been waiting for were destroyed and will never be delivered.

I am certain because of the lawlessness that the Democrats are dangerously silent about, the delivery of mail in Portland, Seattle, Chicago, New York, and Minneapolis, and other cities have been delayed.

You want to talk defunding? Instead of Democrat mayors defunding the police, I would submit that we need to make sure that law enforcement in every American city is well funded so that they can protect not just the post office facilities that handle our mail, but also the people who deliver our mail so that those cards, letters, gifts, and election ballots can be delivered.

Instead of pushing a conspiracy farce, we should be here making sure that law enforcement has the resources needed to protect the property and lives of American families in these cities that are under siege. That will help make sure the mail is delivered on time, and people will feel safe in getting it from the mailbox or the post office.

In that regard, the silence of the Democrats in this Chamber is deadly.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman MALONEY for her good work on this very issue, and I rise to condemn Postmaster General DeJoy's assault on the U.S. Postal Service.

The organizational and operational changes he has been implementing are a betrayal at this moment of the American people. They are turning their backs on seniors and veterans in Pittsfield, North Adams, Springfield, and Southbridge who rely upon the Postal Service for their medications and other essential services.

The Postmaster General is dismantling a lifeline for people in every community across the Commonwealth, but his actions particularly harm those who live in some of the most rural areas in western Massachusetts. These mail delays and disruptions will be harmful at any time, but they are downright deadly during this pan-

demic. Families and small businesses are desperately trying to stay safe and stay afloat as the crisis rages on, and the Postal Service plays a critical role in their survival.

Who else suffers due to the Postmaster General's actions? The hard-working men and women who process and deliver our mail, essential workers. He is compromising jobs for generations that have been a pathway to the middle class, particularly in marginalized communities.

Our Nation's economy and the people's health rely upon the Postal Service. So, too, does American democracy.

Millions will use this indispensable tool to cast their ballots this year. They should not be discouraged. They should be encouraged by the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General is directly attacking the fundamental rights and well-being of all Americans.

I call upon him to step down now. His removal is urgently needed, as are all the provisions in the Delivering for America Act.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation and call on my colleagues to do the same. A reminder: His support right now is urgently needed to reverse what he has been doing and saying.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats talked about a slight delay in mail delivery the last several weeks. Well, of course. Would you want to deliver mail in Portland today, cities that have been under siege for 90-some days? I bet there are delays in Portland, Seattle, Minneapolis, Chicago, and New York. I bet that is where the delays are.

In fact, how do you deliver mail to a CHOP zone, to a CHAZ zone? How do you do that? They won't let them in. I mean, come on. We know the facts here. The facts are the post office has more money today than they had this time last year.

They got a \$14 billion cash reserve. They got a \$10 billion line of credit we gave them in the CARES Act. And oh, the Postmaster General is moving some sorting machines and removing some mail collection boxes, the same thing every Postmaster General has always done. In fact, between 2011 and 2016, the Obama-Biden administration removed 12,000 mail collection boxes. Oh, my goodness. And it is happening again.

We are moving some boxes, and somehow, that is a reason to give \$25 billion to the Postal Service and create all this "conspiracy theory"—not my words; The Wall Street Journal called it—that the Democrats are doing.

What is really going on here? If you really wanted to focus on some concerns the post office has, we have a bipartisan bill that the late Chairman Cummings and MARK MEADOWS worked

on. MARK MEADOWS, I don't even think the Democrats—I know the chairwoman hasn't even talked to him about this, the expert on this issue on our side. Oh, by the way, he happens to have a pretty important job in this town, a pretty important job, and you guys didn't even talk to him.

They had a bipartisan bill. If you really want to work on bipartisan concerns and solutions to some problems in the post office, that is fine, but that is not what this is about. This is all about politics.

You don't want to address real issues, too busy defunding the police, too busy not denouncing the mob that is running so many of our cities. This is all about politics.

First, it was the Russian collusion. In this committee, it was the Michael Cohen hearing. I remember that, when he came, the first big hearing of this Congress. The first-announced witness of this committee came and lied to us seven times. Then, it was the Mueller report. Then, it was the Ukraine fake impeachment. And now, it is the White House is putting mailboxes in cages and whatever you are saying now.

Mr. Speaker, the American people see this for what it is. They see this for what it is. If you want real solutions, we could have had them. You could have worked with Chief of Staff Meadows. You didn't want to do that. You wanted politics.

This was said earlier: If anyone should know, it should be the chairwoman of this committee who had to wait 6 weeks after election day to get the results of her election.

Imagine what the Democrats want to do is throw live ballots out there to everyone. That was just one congressional primary election. Imagine what they want to do—150 million live ballots. That is what the Democrats want. Imagine what that is going to be like. That is where these guys want to go.

Mr. Speaker, we should be working on real solutions instead of this charade that the Democrats are putting us through.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ), the vice chair and an outstanding member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, someone is lying. On one side, you have the White House and the Postmaster General. On the other side, you have the hard-working men and women of the U.S. Postal Service.

The President and the Postmaster General say there is nothing to see here. Nothing to see. They tell us that their operational changes are meant to help the Postal Service.

The Postal Service workers, whose job it is to deliver the mail day in and day out, are saying something different. They are telling us that they are falling behind on processing packages because of these operational changes. As a result, they are seeing

bugs and rodents swimming around containers of rotten food and meat and animals.

Now, my Republican colleagues say that this is a conspiracy theory. But I say to them: You can't smell a conspiracy theory. There are dying animals, rotten food, rotten meat, rats, flies.

You can't see that in a conspiracy theory. I want them to open their eyes because their constituents, my constituents, are suffering because of this deliberate attempt to sabotage the U.S. Postal Service. Their constituents—seniors and veterans who depend on fast delivery of their medicines, the small businesses that depend on the U.S. Postal Service to stay afloat, and every American who wants to partake in our democracy safely during this pandemic.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you which side I believe: the employees of the U.S. Postal Service. It is with them in mind that I strongly support the passage of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. "I urge everyone to be calm. . . . The Postal Service is not incapacitated. It is still fully capable of delivering the mail."

Those are not my words I speak. Those aren't even words of a Republican. They are the words of Ruth Goldway, a Democrat, a former Postal Commissioner and Clinton appointee who served for 18 years under three Presidents.

Based on the facts, Goldway says the Postal Service is perfectly capable of handling election mail.

□ 1500

Unfortunately, we have got bad news for her. This majority didn't get the message. Instead of listening to the experts or following the facts, Democrats are wasting precious time spreading Speaker PELOSI's mailbox myths.

You had an opportunity to have bipartisanship. I have heard words on this floor today, Mr. Speaker, "essential," "critical" that we are here. I applaud the few Democrats on the other side who were willing to show.

I know if you cannot make it today, you have to sign paperwork that your health will not allow you to be here. And the Speaker is bringing us back on a Saturday because it is so critical to be here right now, in this moment, in this time, but one-third on the other side must think otherwise.

Now, let's go through some of the myths versus facts.

Myth no. 1: The Postal Service is being sabotaged.

The Postal Service is properly funded for the election and beyond. We said it many times here. It is funded completely through August 2021. That is according to the Postal Service.

The Postal Service has long-term challenges, but they predate anything

about this administration. It isn't being sabotaged.

Myth no. 2: Removing mailboxes from public places is uncommon and cause for alarm.

This is shocking. We have got country-western stars putting this up on Instagram. We need to rush back here on Saturday. But little did we know that, during the Obama-Biden years, nearly 12,000 mailboxes were removed from communities. Never once did we rush in on a Saturday to have a bill that you didn't have marked up and one-third of the Democrats would not show.

The Postal Service is actually constantly moving mailboxes from low- to high-volume growth areas, kind of a smart thing to do. In some cases, they replace them with more modern versions. I saw a picture where they actually had a lock in the front.

If you have townhall meetings, you will find out a lot of mail gets stolen, so they were protecting the packages but still allowing you to put the letter in. This isn't voter suppression. It is routine maintenance.

Myth no. 3: The Postal Service doesn't have the capacity to handle more absentee ballots.

The Postal Service delivers 471 million pieces of mail on an average day. Little known fact: People mail less every single year. With all of the advancements we put in the Postal Service, with the technology of our own life, do you know what year equalled 471 million? About exactly what we did in 1985.

But we do it different than 1985. We have more technology. And because of that, the Postmaster General actually refuted the capacity in no uncertain terms to the Senate yesterday.

The Postal Service released this: If all Americans vote by mail, 330 million ballots over the course of this election, it would only be 75 percent of what they deliver in a single day.

Now, I don't want to claim, Mr. Speaker, that all the Democrats think this is a myth. Maybe that is why one-third didn't show today. I am not sure. They said their health was bad. I am not sure if that is the case either.

Even The New York Times isn't buying the House Democrats' obvious untruths. As it was reported earlier this month: Experts agree that the Postal Service has the raw capacity to absorb the additional ballots, even if 150 million people decided to vote by mail.

Myth no. 4: The Democrats' legislation will make the Postal Service fiscally sustainable.

You are not fixing any of the fundamentals. You are not even taking the bill that you spent years on, with a Republican and a Democrat, with Elijah Cummings and MARK MEADOWS, two who would say they come from different walks of life, from a philosophy, but found common ground when it came to the post office, to really fix the core of what the problems are. But that is not why we are here today.

So, as the Democrats perpetuate this sad political stunt, unfortunately, there is serious business that goes unmet. But it shows real priority.

This week, we learned that 71 percent of small businesses have used their entire paycheck protection loan—they spent it all—and 46 percent anticipate that they will need more financial support over the next 12 months. But that wasn't critical enough to be here, because these are real people with real families. They don't expect miracles from us, but they do expect us to at least care. Unfortunately, not one piece of legislation in this so-called emergency session is about the families or their future.

Nor are we working to protect vaccine research and support Operation Warp Speed. No, House Democrats are doing what they have done for the last 2 years: They are putting politics before people.

Last month, Speaker PELOSI said to us: We can't go home until a coronavirus relief package is complete.

I guess we know that is not true. I wonder if she wants to keep her word this time as well, but I guess we will go home this Saturday. But good news for one-third of the Democrats: They don't have to go anywhere. They are already home. When she did not get her liberal wish list, she sent Members home. And I guess good news for some Americans: Those who stayed home and voted, they still got paid.

But those small businesses that are running out, that we are here in this body right now that we could do something about, or those who are on unemployment we could do something about—you have the majority; we don't. We are not allowed to bring it to the floor; you can. But you picked a crisis of something that is already funded.

They can't spend the money you want to give them. Why? Because they have got \$14 billion sitting in the bank and another \$10 billion they could pull from. But the small businesses don't. The families that can't pay their rent, they don't. And what about the vaccine?

But you did do something this week. You extended the shadow voting scheme, granting yourselves permission to vote from home until October 2.

Mr. Speaker, I will take a bet. I will make a bet on this floor right now, maybe even a prediction. I bet that gets extended again and probably goes a few days past the election in November.

Who would like to take that bet with me? How much do you want to get that extended all the way through?

What does that mean to the American people? Well, it means the majority party, the Democrats, have cast over 2,520 votes—and counting—from home. That is just unconstitutional. It doesn't matter that it is such a big crisis that we are called back. There is plenty of room on the floor on the other side.

It means a Democrat Member can dial in from his boat to vote. I am not making that up. That actually happened.

It means another Democrat can play hooky to go watch a space shuttle launch that isn't even in his own district.

It means Democrats collect a paycheck while the hardworking taxpayers have to pay for their vacation.

And today, it means that 68 Democrats—one-third of their Caucus—didn't even care enough to show up for this so-called emergency session.

It is critical. I have heard you say it. We cannot wait. We cannot wait one day. We need to be here and now. Now, I believe that is true, but not about the post office; about those millions of Americans who need us to act.

Every time we brought legislation to this floor dealing with the COVID situation, it seems to me the Speaker has been able to hold it up. I don't know. Maybe you want to try to hold it up past the election. It seems to me that would be playing politics. It seems to me that would be a dereliction of duty. It is not how you empower the people's voice in Washington; it is how you dilute it. This is leadership malpractice. This is shameful and this is embarrassing.

Mr. Speaker, our first Postmaster General, whom I have heard people speak of, Ben Franklin, could have been talking about this majority when he said: "Lost time is never found again."

As a majority, Democrats have been more focused on distractions than solutions for the American people, from the weakest, most partisan impeachment in American history to politicizing the pandemic and stopping relief for workers and families and, now, spreading a debunked conspiracy theory about the Postal Service.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have failed the American public. They have failed the laid-off workers, the families, the students who are waiting for help; the small businesses, the doctors, the nurses, they are waiting for help; the researchers, the scientists who are developing a vaccine, they are waiting for help. But this majority said no.

They did, however, say yes to China. On this floor, just a few weeks ago, there was a bill to sanction anyone who would hack into our companies, into our institutions that are working on a vaccine faster than ever before—that would only slow it down—to save lives.

We had an opportunity to tell those countries: Work with us; don't steal from us. But your voice was heard loud and clear, all the Democrats who showed up that day. More than two-thirds of you voted "no" on the same day that it was reported that two Chinese were hacking into our vaccine. That is what you said.

I heard the majority leader say it was an MTR. Yes, it was.

Why was it an MTR? Because you don't give us an amendment.

Why was it an MTR? Because at the moment in time, it was essential, it was critical. It was reported on that day. You could act that day. The country needed us to act, but you said no. You stood up for the Chinese that day.

I do not know what the Chinese Communist Party has on the Democrats, Mr. Speaker, but it must be powerful. It must be so powerful.

I know there are bills in the Senate that have passed that would hold them accountable, but they can't come to the floor.

I have read the reports from the FBI that they are playing in this campaign, that they do have a person they want to win, to put a new person in office, but that is not critical to you.

It is critical that we come today to provide \$25 billion to an organization that Republicans and Democrats, that are the commissioners, say they do not need.

Why do they not need it? Because they looked at their own bank account and realized they have \$14 billion. They do not need it because, in the CARES Act, we gave them another \$10 billion to sit there. They do not need it because they said they could deliver every piece of mail, that it would be only 75 percent of what they do in a single day.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say all the Democrats feel that way, because one-third of them didn't show up for work today even though their own leader, the Speaker, said they needed to come, even though, when we passed on this floor something different than we haven't done in more than 230 years, to let somebody stay home, be on a boat, call in, and still get paid, you said you could not do that. You could only do it if your health was at need. I am not quite sure a hospital is on a boat in a lake, but to Democrats it must be.

They won't vote on a bill that I propose to sanction Chinese-affiliated hackers who attack our vaccine research. I am not sure that is partisan. I thought that was pure American.

They won't help working Americans. They won't help protect our vaccines. But, yes, they stood that day proudly supporting of the Chinese Communist Party.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. America's too great for a vision so small with our challenges before us.

We showed up. But you know why we showed up? We showed up for the small businesses. We showed up for those who are unemployed. We showed up for those school districts that want to find a way to open safely. We showed up for the doctors and the nurses.

I know, when I look up on the board, there will be a lot of Democrat votes. I don't know where those one-third are. Maybe they are on the boat. Maybe they are watching a spaceship. I am not sure. Maybe some are watching Oprah.

But one thing I do know, it is essential that we are here. But we should be

here for other reasons. We should be here for the reasons that the American public expect us to.

Mr. Speaker, we can do so much better. This country needs us. We should rise to the occasion, not fall for a vision so small as what I see today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1515

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I had not necessarily intended to speak after the minority leader, but I cannot help but respond to some of what the minority leader had to say.

First of all, he practices the President's favorite tactic. Distract. Speak about that which is not relevant. All the Democrats are voting. They may be voting at that machine. They may be voting at that machine over there. They may be voting at that machine, or they may be voting at that machine back there. They may be voting by proxy, which you didn't like. The minority leader sued, and the Court said it is up to the House to decide its own rules.

Now, when we passed the HEROES Act 100 days ago tomorrow, what did the minority leader say? Let's wait and see what happens. And what has happened since then? Thousands, tens of thousands of people have gotten sick, and thousands and thousands of people have died in those days. Let's wait and see.

And what did the majority leader, who can put a bill on the floor, what did he say? Let the States go bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk on the floor about bring this bill or that bill or the other bill. The Senate is controlled by your party, I tell my minority friends in the House. They haven't passed a single bill in 70 days, in 100 days, not a single bill. Why? Because they would have to compromise.

And you say we need to bring things to the floor. The minority leader, of course, had a man named Garland, from February to January when Obama was the President of the United States, and refused to consider it. Do you think there is a Founding Father who thought that advice and consent meant that they could simply ignore the President's nominations? I think not.

Some people talk about, Oh, there are some very, very important things to do. One of them, the gentlewoman from North Carolina—now, let me, 84,631 deaths since HEROES passed. Let's wait. We passed HEROES. No action in the Republican-controlled and led United States Senate. So don't whine to me about what you want on the floor. Don't whine to me about we could have done this, we could have done that, we could have done the other.

Mr. Speaker, I was just talking to the chief of staff of the White House, and I kidded him, I said, You know, when you were here in the House and we had Republican leadership and they offered solutions, you undermined them.

Who says so? John Boehner says so. You had the opportunity to make a deal.

Now we control the House, and very frankly, the majority leader cannot pass a bill because 20 of your Members in the United States Senate want to do nothing, and just tell the people who are suffering, who are on unemployment, who don't have childcare, you are on your own.

Now, I have heard all this talk about what we could have done. Do it. Do it. NANCY PELOSI and Secretary Mnuchin got four deals done. Most of you voted for them, and they passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion. But you made a decision, nope, no more.

Now we have it speculated that if we don't take action and have a much more robust—and a plan for dealing with COVID-19, which we don't have and haven't had, because this President called it a hoax. You don't have to respond to hoaxes. That is what he called it, a hoax. And, of course, if it is a hoax you don't respond, and he didn't.

And over 175,000—86,000 since we passed HEROES—175,000, and CDC says it may be up to 200,000 by the end of this year. Still, you have passed no bill in the United States.

We sent a bill over there. You don't like it, that is fine, pass your own. You control the Senate. Pass your own, and then we will go to conference. We will see which bill is better, or maybe we will put them together. But what has the Senate majority leader done? He has reduced the \$1 trillion offer down to \$500 billion, which the governor of my State says is only sufficient to help the States because they are hemorrhaging revenue, and they are on the front lines of responding to this crisis.

Now, others of you have said all of this is a feign, this is not real.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Madam Chair, has she spoken about the report from the Postmaster General?

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Yes, I have.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat it, notwithstanding that.

It says, "The new documents being released by the committee today are part of the PMG briefing."

Now, I hope the Postmaster General, unlike the President of the United States, reads his briefings.

The President says he doesn't read his briefings, so he didn't know about the Russian payments to kill American soldiers and has not responded to this date on that assertion.

The new documents being released by the committee today are part of the PMG briefing, a presentation prepared directly for the Postmaster General last week on August 12, 10 days ago. They provide a detailed assessment of

service performance trends over the past year.

My friend from Ohio says, Oh, this is a fraud. There is no problem. Not a big deal. Maybe he didn't read the PMG advisory either.

According to these documents, there has been a significant drop in service standards across the board beginning in July, including first-class, marketing, periodicals, and priority mail.

The Postmaster General, of course, has never admitted to the sweeping delays and reductions in service caused by the actions. Instead, here is what he said: "We all feel bad about what the dip in the level of service has been."

So he knows there was a dip in service right after he made these changes. Now, what do we know?

A, we know he is a big supporter of the President, gave a lot of money to the President.

Secondly, we know he was appointed by the President. Essentially, yes, elected by the Board of Governors—all thanks to the membership appointed by President Trump—who, by the way, unanimously asked for the \$25 billion we are talking about.

We know the President of the United States wants to suppress the vote.

Why?

He says so. He says so.

The first meeting I had with the President of the United States with Republican leaders and Democratic leaders just shortly after he was inaugurated President, the first thing he said was, I got a majority of the votes.

If it hadn't been fraud, if it hadn't been all those people that voted illegally, I would have gotten the majority of votes. He only got 62 million. 70 million voted for somebody else. And 65 million people, the majority of the people of the United States voting for President of the United States, voted for Hillary Clinton.

I challenge one of you to name me two members of the electoral college in 2016. You can't do it. The American people voted for Hillary Clinton.

The President of the United States wants to send, maybe with no name tags and just sort of brown suits on, troops to the polls of America. Never in my life—and I have run probably for office more times than anybody here but DON YOUNG—never have I seen armed troops there at the polls to intimidate people.

My State checks for fraud. And, by the way, all those fraudulent votes that Donald Trump said had been cast, not a conviction. He controls the Justice Department. He controls, presumably, the FBI.

Going back to what I said about this crisis that was occurring that you say doesn't exist in the post office.

On January 15, 2013, we voted for a crisis, 50 million Americans living in the northeast had been savaged by Superstorm Sandy. About 230 of you Republicans were here, you were in charge. Only 49 of you, not Mr. MEADOWS, not Ms. FOXX, 49 voted for that

bill, and 178 of you voted no. No crisis. 50 million Americans. Superstorm Sandy. People being flooded out of their businesses and homes. No crisis.

My suggestion is, wherever you are, you came here and that's great, you are here, you can vote in person. Isn't that wonderful. I think your vote would count just as much if you had voted—but your leadership has told you, no, don't worry about the 86,000 people who have died. The minority leader said, well, the crisis is gone. I don't know where he thinks it went. It is certainly visiting the neighborhoods in my State and the neighborhoods in your State.

So the report says the mail has substantially gone down since the Postmaster General—aiding and abetting, in my opinion, the President of the United States who wishes to suppress the vote—acted.

Now, I don't know how many of you read 18 U.S. Code 1703, but it says, "Whoever being a Postal Service officer or employee"—and says some other things about secrets, destroys, detains, opens, et cetera—"whoever delays mail, which was intended to be conveyed by mail, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

Now, I had a press conference with Senator WARNER, Senator VAN HOLLEN, and six other Members, including EL-EANOR HOLMES NORTON, one of the senior members of the Chair's committee. Five minutes before we held that press conference, the Postmaster General issued his statement that he was going to stop doing what he was doing. I guess it was because he thought, Well, what I am doing is great, everybody will support what I am doing. Or, did he think, I got my hand caught in the cookie jar and I better stop? Which do you think is the more rational determination as to why 5 minutes before he had that press conference he issued his release? That he thought it was fine? He could defend it? It was the right thing to do?

If he thought all of those, why in heaven's name did he change his mind?

I will tell you why. He knew what he did was wrong. He probably read that briefing that service had plummeted since he took that action, and that he was putting the mail, prescription drugs, Social Security checks, veterans' checks, at risk.

That seems to me to be the logical conclusion. And as the law says, if you act and you delay the mail, you commit a crime, subject to 5 years in jail, and a substantial fine.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

The Postmaster General appeared to back down from his attempt to set the Postal Service up for failure just moments before a number of us, as I have said, from the House and Senate were about to speak in front of the Postal Service headquarters right down the street.

In his testimony yesterday, the Postmaster General indicated that he and President Trump are simply hitting pause. They don't care about the diminution of service that the Postmaster General's report said, apparently. They just hit pause. Why? Because they are hoping it will go away, the wrongdoing that they are perpetrating, not what was done in the past by, yes: Should we make service efficient and effective? We should. But that is not why this was done.

All you have to do is look at the President's statement about wanting to suppress the vote, particularly of minorities. He said that if more Blacks had voted in the last election, I would have lost. That is what he said.

In his statement on Tuesday, the Postmaster General indicated that no additional changes would be implemented. In other words, he is not going to back up, even though his report says it is diminishing service. Why? He can pledge all he wants, but if you don't give the post office department and its employees the tools with which to do the job, no matter what he says about voting—I am glad that we make sure that first-class mail treatment—as a matter of fact, there ought to be super-first class.

Voting for the President of the United States has got to be the most important thing a citizen does in this election year, and it ought to be treated as such by the postal department.

Even after 3 months, President Trump and Senate Republicans continue to refuse to take action on the HEROES Act. I talked about that. That is why Congress needs to take action now that will ensure our Postal Service can continue to deliver for America through this pandemic, just as it always has reliably delivered for our people. That is why this legislation is necessary.

Millions depend on the Postal Service to obtain medications, receive paychecks, and access vital services. For rural communities, in particular, the Postal Service—that is the irony. For rural communities, the Postal Service is probably even more important.

This year, in particular, it will play a crucial role, the Postal Service, in helping tens of millions of Americans stay safe from COVID-19. 86,000 Americans have died since we passed the HEROES Act. The minority leader seems to think: Well, people not coming to Congress, not wanting to get on an airplane, not wanting to come to Washington and then go home and have to sequester themselves for 14 days, oh, they are just playing games.

If you doubt the validity of their vote, say so. But whether I cast it far over there or near here, it is the same vote. It is my vote, and it is my people's voice.

It was so angering for Americans across the political spectrum that President Trump and Postmaster General DeJoy openly sabotaged the Postal Service in order to prevent people from

casting votes through the mail. I know you can discount the fact that the President wants to suppress the vote. He said so. I am not making it up. He said so. Oh, we have all the fraud.

By the way, he votes by mail, of course. You all understand that. I don't know that he sends an ID card down when he votes. Well, maybe we ought to check on that. You are so interested in ID cards, let's see if the President of the United States sends an ID card down to Florida.

They employed tactics such as eliminating overtime pay, cutting routes short, reassigning experienced managers, et cetera.

Maybe you guys and gals don't have a constituent office open. But every one of my Members tells me they are hearing from thousands of their people.

Congress, therefore, must take action to prevent them from simply changing their minds and causing massive postal delays in the weeks ahead. Remember, he said he has just delayed his changes, which caused the fall in service.

Delivering for America Act, that is what the postal department has done since before the Constitution was adopted. I am not going to go through what it will require. You know what it will require. But it would particularly require, and I am so pleased, Madam Chair, that you included in your bill first-class treatment because voting is first-class priority in America.

Now, I am going to close with this because so many of you said: This bill is not going to pass. You are wasting your time. You shouldn't send it over there.

If we did that, we wouldn't do anything unless the President said you can do it. Then, we would salute and say: "Yes, sir. We will do it. But if you don't want it, sir, if you don't want FISA—126 of us voted for FISA, but if you don't want it, we will change our minds in 24 hours," which is what you did.

But then again, we wouldn't have sent campaign finance reform over there because MCCONNELL hasn't considered it. We wouldn't have sent investment and infrastructure and jobs, which MCCONNELL has not put on the floor. We wouldn't have sent restoring voting rights or ensuring LGBT equality or protecting Dreamers or ensuring equal pay for women because MCCONNELL hasn't put equal pay for women on the floor.

Requiring background checks for safer communities, only 90 percent of Americans are for that, so I can understand why MCCONNELL said: Look, there is 10 percent against it. I am not going to put it on the floor for consideration.

You say you haven't gotten notice, and you haven't been included in the committee, et cetera. MCCONNELL doesn't allow anybody to vote, your leader.

Meeting the challenge of climate change, well, of course, many of you don't believe climate change is real. I understand that.

Providing for justice in policing, did we send it over there? Yes. Why? Because we want a fair, more just, more equal, more racially conscious Nation. And I say racially conscious in the sense that we don't judge people on the color of their skin.

We strengthened and expanded the ACA, which in a pandemic may well have been very helpful. It hasn't been put on the floor.

Protecting workers' rights to organize and receive their pensions, it hasn't been put on the floor.

So, if you tell me this can't pass, it can't pass perhaps because the President of the United States tells you that he is not for it, and so it doesn't pass.

In closing—and I know many of you have said thank God—in closing, let me say that you ought to vote for this bill. Not for Democrats. You ought to vote for it for your people, for the people in your rural neighborhoods who are counting on the postal department to bring that prescription drug, which is critical to maintain their health or save their lives. You ought to vote for it for the over 1 million people getting Social Security checks in the mail.

That is why you ought to vote for it, not for us.

You ought to vote for it because you want everybody to vote; you want everybody to participate in this democracy; you want an election that has, like so many other countries, 80 percent of our people participating, who don't want to be the 86,001 who die because they went someplace and aggregated together and got COVID-19.

That is what this is about, making our people able to participate safely in their democracy.

Vote for this bill. It is not a partisan bill. It is a bill that says Republicans ought to be safe in voting. Democrats ought to be safe in voting. Independents ought to be safe in voting, if that is what they choose to do.

This is a good bill. It is a bill for America's democracy. It is a bill for making sure that our people are connected through the mail.

I thank the chair for bringing this bill to the floor. Vote "yes." I urge a "yes" vote for all Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 25 minutes. The gentlewoman from New York has 24 minutes.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LATTA.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the ranking member, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, which has not gone through regular order and was put together in

response to misinformation and conspiracies online.

Since the closure of the Toledo, Ohio, processing plant in 2012, mail in northwest Ohio has been sent to the Metroplex Processing Facility in Michigan. As my constituents can attest, this new arrangement has not worked. We have experienced countless delays and destroyed and lost mail for years, including more than 1,000 absentee ballots in the 2016 general election.

That is why I have continuously engaged with the USPS to fix these problems and get our mail sorted in Ohio. They have committed to working with me and officials in Ohio to implement procedures for election materials.

Unfortunately, under H.R. 8015, the USPS would be prohibited from making any changes to their operation if it is determined that the changes would impede prompt, reliable, and efficient services.

It doesn't specifically say who will be making this determination, so it is safe to assume it will be the unelected bureaucrats, individuals who have told me for years that the preferred way to sort mail would be through the Metroplex. Now, this bill could legally prohibit absentee ballots from being processed in Ohio-based sorting facilities.

I cannot in good conscience support this new Democratic political sideshow because it threatens the rights of my constituents to have their voices heard in November.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this legislation.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act. This legislation is vital to protecting the United States Postal Service.

I maintain that the post office is the thread that holds the fabric of our great country together. The Postal Service existed before our Nation's Constitution as the lifeline that connected far-flung communities. The Founders believed so strongly in the importance of the post office that they enshrined it in our Constitution.

The post office provides a critical public service that we cannot allow to become a potential political pawn of a dysfunctional, destructive, and, I dare say, disastrous administration. This administration has demonstrated time and again why government should not be run like a business. Businesses exist to make profits. The post office and the whole of our government exist to provide services. That is why it is called a Postal Service, not the postal corporation.

Today, we are acting to reinforce our Postal Service system, which provides vital services like delivering medica-

tions, Social Security benefits, income and tax payments, veterans benefits, Census forms, and absentee ballots to all American communities, however remote they may be.

Americans' dependence on the Postal Service has dramatically increased during this pandemic as we have watched the on-time delivery of mail decrease significantly. This legislation provides the \$25 billion in emergency COVID funding to the Postal Service that was unanimously requested by the bipartisan Board of Governors.

It also prohibits and even rolls back changes made by the post office since January 1 of this year. That prohibition lasts through January 2021 or until the end of the pandemic, whichever is later.

That means no post office can be closed, consolidated, or reduce hours; no prohibition or restriction of overtime pay; no changes that will delay mail delivery or increase the volume of undelivered mail; and no removal of post office infrastructure, like sorting machines or mailboxes.

This legislation protects the integrity of our democracy by requiring that all election mail be treated as first class, which means ballots must be postmarked, processed, and cleared on the same day that they are received.

□ 1545

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member COMER for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles from periodicals.

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 18, 2020]

DEMOCRATS FUEL POST OFFICE PANIC WITH LIES TO WIN UPCOMING ELECTION

(By Andy Biggs)

There are two almost immutable laws of operation that form the basis of America's political left. The first is that Democrats and leftists foment fear in order to obtain and maintain political power. The other is that they always accuse everyone else, conservatives and Republicans, of acts, words and ideas in which the left is engaged.

If that means that the truth must be adulterated in order to craft a narrative that gins up panic and hysteria, they will shade the truth. Lies beget panic, panic calls for a solution—usually a big spending solution—and the Democrats try to exploit that panic to get more power.

The Democrats are engaged in a disinformation campaign regarding the upcoming election and mail-in ballots that is deceptive and reflective of their goal of winning the election by hook or crook.

Democrats and their left-wing publicists in the media claim that President Trump is going to dismantle the United States Postal Service (USPS). This absurdity typifies both of the Democratic strategies: It is a lie to engender panic, and the stealing of the election is their objective, not the president's.

They claim that Mr. Trump is going to fiscally starve the behemoth USPS in order to prevent all mailed ballots from being counted. Of course, neither claim is true.

The president signed a bill that provided an additional \$10 billion to the USPS just a few weeks ago. At the time, Treasury Sec-

retary Steve Mnuchin said, "While the USPS is able to fund its operating expenses without additional borrowing at this time, we are pleased to have reached an agreement on the material terms and conditions of a loan, should the need arise."

And, White House Chief of Staff Mark Meadows also confirmed on CNN that the White House offered the additional \$10 billion in funding to the Postal Service. Refreshing the left's collective memory about the availability of massive amounts of funding to the USPS ought to have put this phony claim to bed.

But House Speaker Nancy Pelosi is insisting that the House of Representatives return to vote on additional funding for the USPS, which illustrates the Democrats' overarching theme: Just send money; it will always solve the problem, whatever the problem is, even if there is no real problem.

The second deception that the Democrats are using to try and steal the upcoming election is by conflating the long-established practice of absentee balloting with the election-fraud-producing scam that the left is selling of universal mail-in ballots. By consolidating the two, very different voting procedures, they are trying to scare Americans into believing that Mr. Trump is going to cheat in the upcoming election.

This is consistent with Democrats' operating strategy and the methodology that they will accuse you of what they are actually trying to accomplish. In this case, the Democrats are trying to steal the election by sending ballots out to every name on every voter roll. But they are fighting against cleaning up the voter rolls.

Your uncle is dead but still on the voter roll? A ballot comes to his last address in his name. Your cat is somehow on the roll? Fluffy gets a ballot.

Democrats know that their demands will incentivize and produce fraudulent ballots by sending out ballots to those who haven't requested them. They are OK with that because they think they can win the dead voter and pet cat demographics.

They accuse Mr. Trump of defunding the USPS—when the left really wants to defund the police—and their accusation is a lie. They know that the president supports the long-standing practice of absentee voting, but claim he is against that. Another lie.

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi is so concerned that she is bringing the House back into session to vote on legislation that means nothing. Oh yeah, it's urgent alright, but only after the Democratic convention is completed. Oh, and it's only to give Democrats the opportunity to further the panic-driven narrative, because the Senate isn't going to hear the speaker's deceptive bill.

Never forget that the Democrats and left always accuse you of what they are actually doing and that they will prevaricate to further that claim. The left will try and stoke panic in the country, then attempt to spend any amount of money to quell that panic in order to arrogate power.

The deception surrounding the USPS "crisis" is just another great example of Marxian-Democrat duplicity.

[From the Blaze, Aug. 21, 2020]

POSTMASTER GENERAL PROMISES TIMELY DELIVERY OF ELECTION MAIL, SAYS USPS DOESN'T NEED BALLOT MONEY

(By Aaron Cole)

Postmaster General Louis DeJoy denied accusations that the United States Postal Service wouldn't be able to handle increased volumes of election mail in November, and told the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on Friday that the USPS was "fully capable" of getting the job done, CBS News reported.

DeJoy has been a target of Democrats who believe the Trump donor and logistics expert is handicapping the Postal Service at the president's urging in order to discourage or limit mail-in voting.

"As we head into the election season, I want to assure this committee, and the American public, that the Postal Service is fully capable of delivering the nation's election mail securely and on time," DeJoy testified.

DeJoy said even mail-in ballots sent one week before Election Day would be counted, because USPS workers will "scour every plant each night leading up to Election Day" to make sure no ballot is left behind.

Rather than being opposed to mail-in voting, as President Donald Trump is, DeJoy told the committee "I think the American public should be able to vote by mail, and the Postal Service will support it."

DeJoy clarified that the potential issue with mail-in ballots is related to state deadlines that are too close to Election Day, which is why 46 states were notified of that issue in a letter late last month. DeJoy said Americans should vote early, if they can.

The U.S. Postal Service plans to "send a letter to every American" explaining "what our process is" for mail-in voting, DeJoy said Friday.

DeJoy, who has been in his role since June, said he has never spoken to Trump or White House advisers about making changes to service.

The USPS has long been in bad financial shape, and DeJoy was hired as a logistics expert from the private sector to address issues of cost and efficiency. Some of the changes that have reportedly been made, such as the limiting of overtime and the removal of some mail sorting machines and collection boxes, have led to some delays in mail delivery in some areas. Those operational changes were suspended by DeJoy this week to avoid the appearance of tampering with the Nov. 3 election.

Some recent primary elections were disrupted by issues with mail-in ballots. A New York congressional election was delayed by six weeks due to a dispute over some ballots that were not postmarked or that were received after the deadline. Tens of thousands of votes that were mailed in weren't counted for various reasons.

Democrats are pushing for billions of dollars in additional funding for the USPS, partially to help with the election. On Friday, DeJoy told Congress the USPS did not need a federal bailout, but did advocate for reimbursement for service provided during the pandemic even while revenues were down.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, "The Postal Service is fully capable of delivering the Nation's election mail securely and on time." That was the testimony of the Postmaster General.

But they don't trust the Postmaster General.

The post office has taken care of over 400 million pieces of mail every day.

But they don't trust the Postmaster General.

That is intriguing to me, because they are going to give the Postmaster General an additional \$25 billion. They don't trust him, yet they are going to give him \$25 billion when he already has \$15 billion cash on hand and a \$10 billion line of credit. We don't trust this guy, but we are going to give him \$25 billion extra.

But moreover, this is a crisis. We want reforms. We want changes. We don't trust the current Postmaster

General, so what we are going to do is we are going to proscribe any kind of efforts to make the post office, Postal Service, work better. We are going to stop that. Not only are we going to stop that, we are going to give a new cause of action to trial lawyers against the USPS.

That is what is going on in this bill, and I find that intriguing. It reminds me of a Eugene Ionesco play, Luigi Pirandello. We are talking theater of the absurd here. That is what we are talking about.

Democrats call the failures of USPS a crisis, but they are going to prohibit reforms or changes. Think of the irony of that.

I would suggest that this illustrates the Democrats' overarching theme: If you just send money, it will always solve the problem, whatever the problem is, even if there is no real problem.

This is not a money issue. This is not an acute issue. This is a long-term problem that has been there for multiple administrations.

Now, to come in at the last minute—and here is part of the absurdity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILD). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, the richest part of this irony, this absurdity, is: Here we are today. We are going to vote on this bill today, and we are going to have the hearing on Monday in the committee. That is the richest part of an absurdity that is going to cost us \$25 billion.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, just as a point of clarification, there is no cause of action in this bill, and it does not in any way hinder any efficiency that would speed up the mail. It merely stops any action that slows down the mail until the end of this pandemic.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), an extremely valuable member of the committee.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to say: Enough. In a blatant attempt to suppress the vote, the occupant has continued to attack the legitimacy of our elections, denouncing the very method of voting he and his family have repeatedly used: mail-in ballots.

Hypocrisy: It should look familiar to my colleagues across the aisle.

How dare you refer to this as a sham bill. The only sham here is the patriotism that you allege to espouse while you stand idly by and are complicit in the dismantling of the United States Postal Service, which is impacting the lives of all of our constituents, disrupting services.

Patriotism: They hire more veterans than anyone else. Veterans rely on them to receive lifesaving medication. The only sham here is the patriotism which you espouse.

Enough of the criminal and corrupt mismanagement of the Postmaster General. The changes he has brought to our Postal Service during this pandemic are brazen acts of sabotage intended to slow down operations and to delay mail delivery.

This is a hell of a way to repay 600,000 dedicated letter carriers and postal workers who have put themselves in harm's way in the midst of this pandemic, who find dignity in their work and are worried about the impact on services and fear for their very livelihoods and retribution for the calls that they have made to all of our offices.

How dare you.

While the Trump administration and its allies continue to gaslight the American people, we actually listen to our constituents and their lived experiences and how this has disrupted their lives, what you are referring to as fakes news, constituents like Cassandra, a freelancer from Somerville who waited for 2 weeks for a check from a client to arrive.

"Freelancing is already unstable," she told me, "and post office delays mean I have even less assurance that the money I have worked for will reach me in a timely fashion."

Or Brendan in Charlestown, who requested an absentee ballot more than 3 weeks ago so he and his pregnant wife could vote without risking their health but has yet to receive it because, in the Massachusetts Seventh Congressional District, nine mail sorting machines have been removed.

There must be accountability. It is time to pass the Delivering for America Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8015 and the manufactured crisis my Democratic colleagues have created regarding the U.S. Postal Service.

For the past week, the American people have been told they cannot trust the Postal Service to do their job and that Republicans, along with President Trump, are trying to undermine the agency.

That could not be further from the truth. The Postal Service has more than enough funding to operate for the next calendar year and has not even acted upon the \$10 billion loan the Treasury offered back in July.

The sad truth is that the Postal Service has been financially unsustainable and without reform for over a decade, and the bill we are voting on today will do nothing, absolutely nothing, to improve the shortfalls with this agency.

We should, instead, be working together to address certain problems we have while being conscious of the taxpayer dollars that have been used for bailouts over the years.

Madam Speaker, I have a rural district in Texas, District 25. We rely

upon the Postal Service to fulfill services that my constituents would otherwise go without. I am an advocate for improving this agency, and we should dedicate time to do just that, but there is an actual crisis among us that should demand our immediate attention.

In the car business, you can't charge the sticker price if you don't have a vehicle to deliver, and you don't sell used cars that won't start. We are not delivering results today. The immediate crisis we need to address is caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Main Street America and families across Texas are wanting results, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would rather ignore this truth and, instead, politicize a conspiracy theory. If my colleagues are serious about postal reform, then let's get to work, but the legislation before us today isn't the answer. It is, frankly, a waste of time.

I should be home with my family. I should be home with my grandchildren. As we say in Texas, "This dog won't hunt." Well, let me tell you, this dog won't hunt.

And, P.S., let's make the Postal Service run like a business.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB), another great member of the committee.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, do you hear that? That is our democracy crumbling.

I want all of my neighbors, I want all of America to know why the people's House is here for an emergency vote on Saturday while Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL went on vacation: We are experiencing a global pandemic, and now our U.S. Postal Service is under attack.

Let it be clear: This administration is waging an authoritarian campaign to sabotage this election by manipulating the Postal Service to suppress our votes, and they are threatening the livelihood of our postal workers, our seniors, our veterans, and so many more in the process.

This is not a conspiracy theory. This is fascism. We will not stand for this now or ever.

In Michigan right now, machines capable of sorting 35,000 pieces of mail per hour have disappeared from postal facilities.

Brave workers are blowing the whistle and saying that they have never seen anything like this, Madam Speaker.

We must put an end to it.

Madam Speaker, I say to the White House: Hands off the United States Postal Service.

Let's make it clear through this law to fund our Postal Service and undo these harmful attacks and restore normal operations.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, our presence today, this unserious legislation, even all the yelling across the aisle and the straying off topic, they all underscore a contrast: Democrats whip up hysteria; Republicans show up to work.

They call a Saturday session, supposedly because of an emergency. Republicans are here, but about 70 Democrats don't show up. And that has been the pattern all summer: Republicans come to work; Democrats dial it in, sometimes from the fishing boat.

They say the virus keeps them from congregating to work, but they encourage the throng outside the Postmaster General's personal residence.

Or consider Representative GRIJALVA: not at work today, but joined a postal union protest 4 days ago. They can congregate to whip up hysteria, just not to work.

Now, Louis DeJoy is showing up to work. Testifying yesterday, he calmly debunked apocryphal tales about blue collection boxes and sorting machines.

Monday, he testifies before the House Oversight and Reform Committee, but Democrats fan hysteria today without waiting for facts, even though they don't show up.

Let's drop the hysteria. Let's all show up to work. Americans need our help.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), an outstanding member of the committee.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman of the committee for yielding.

I support this bill strongly.

I want to speak a little bit to what the Postmaster General acknowledged—admitted—yesterday. He called it a dip in service. He finally admitted that after being pressed extensively on it.

I want to tell you what the dip looks like in my district.

So, in all of 2019, our constituent service folks opened 11 cases to deal with delays and service problems with the mail—11 cases in 2019. So far this year, there have been 106.

Now, I am not talking about people who are just calling in and complaining because the mail is late and then they hang up the phone and so forth. This is where they have got real concerns about what is happening and they ask us to open a case. There have been 106 this year compared with 11 last year, and 103 of those in the last 4 weeks.

That is not a dip in service. That is a collapse of service, and it tracks exactly to the time that Louis DeJoy has been on the job.

Here is what is so terrible: When you attack the Postal Service from within, which is what he is doing, it has the effect of trying to separate the postal workers from the public that trusts them.

Over 90 percent of Americans have a favorable opinion of the Postal Service. We have to restore that bond. That is what this legislation does.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member COMER for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I stand today with the hardworking letter carriers and postal workers of the United States Postal Service.

The USPS must be fully funded so that my constituents and millions across our Nation can receive the high-quality and timely service that the post office has always provided us.

Madam Speaker, today I will vote in favor of the Delivering for America Act.

Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, must come together and address the serious challenges that USPS has been facing for quite some time now. I look forward to continuing to work with our colleagues on bipartisan solutions to move all of our heroes forward and support our heroes at the U.S. Postal Service.

□ 1600

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), who is the vice chair of our caucus.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, 99 days ago House Democrats passed the HEROES Act to provide much-needed relief to the American people suffering from this pandemic.

What was the reaction from the GOP?

A shrug.

Funding for State and local governments to protect jobs of first responders and teachers?

MITCH MCCONNELL said: Let them go bankrupt.

Feeding hungry children and families?

They said: Let's hit the pause button.

Funding for testing, treatment, and hospitals as death tolls soared over 175,000?

Donald Trump said: It is what it is.

Unemployment benefits and eviction protection?

Not right now.

In May, we also funded the post office, a critical service enshrined in our Constitution, a lifeline to seniors and veterans, like John, who called me yesterday from my hometown who had to wait an extra week to get his medication.

It is a pillar of our democracy allowing people to vote safely from home this fall. We are here today to defend this institution from slow deliveries and removal of critical mail infrastructure. Twelve mail sorting machines in my home State have been removed.

When Mr. DeJoy was asked about this, he said: They are not needed.

Donald Trump said he didn't want those ridiculous ballots delivered.

We will not stand by while the Postal Service is dismantled and good jobs are lost. We will fight so that every vote is counted.

Vote "yes" for the Postal Service. Vote "yes" for the people. Vote "yes" for democracy.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS).

Mr. CURTIS. Madam Speaker, like many of my constituents, I have followed the allegations circling around the Postal Service. These are serious allegations. To get to the heart of the problem, I spoke directly to Utah's postal leadership.

As I asked questions and waded through the rumors, I learned four important facts:

First, it is clear that the Postal Service needs additional funding. How much and under what circumstances is a worthy debate. But let me be clear: the funding solution has no bearing on their ability to handle the upcoming mail-in ballots. The United States Postal Service has enough cash on hand to operate well into 2021.

Second, the increased demand of mail-in ballots does not stretch their capacity. Mail-in ballots will increase the demand on the system by a little over 1.5 percent. In the words of Utah's district director, not even a bump in volume. The day I spoke with him Utah's mail delivery system was 500,000 letters under capacity.

Third, the accusation that they are removing boxes and cutting overtime to thwart mail-in ballots is just plain not true. Boxes have always been moved to adjust to volume. To calm fears, the Postal Service has put a 90-day moratorium on moving boxes.

Likewise, rumors that overtime is being cut so mail-in ballots will be delayed is false. I confirmed this with Utah's district director. In his words: Never in my career have we left mail undelivered because of overtime.

Fourth, the concerns with mail-in balloting have everything to do with the State's preparedness, not the Postal Service. States who have allowed ballots to be requested just 4 days before election are irresponsible and should be accountable for mail-in ballot problems, not the United States Postal Service. Further, mail-in ballots take longer to count and delays can be expected, but not because of the Postal Service.

Madam Speaker, if you are not sure whom to believe, ask your mail carrier. Ask them if there is anything less than 100 percent effort given by them to deliver mail-in ballots and all mail, and then make sure to thank them. I am so grateful for the many men and women who work so hard to deliver our mail every day.

We need a strong and vibrant Postal Service, but this bill thrown together in the middle of the night does not deliver.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), who is the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Health on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I am here today to speak on behalf of the Postal Service in our country.

I am here today because I view it as a Democratic institution in our country.

I am here today because the Framers placed it in the Constitution.

I am here today because my constituents are not receiving their prescription drugs, businesses are not receiving their mail, and people are not receiving their mail.

I am here today to speak on their behalf because they are outraged. They are outraged about two things that have happened, that the President has said and attacked mail-in votes.

Guess how votes are counted?

They are carried by the mail service.

The Postmaster General, instead of building it up, is dismantling it. It is over the top to see pictures of postal boxes being unhinged.

Vote for the Delivering for America Act. The people deserve it.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), who is the Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

When you think about why we are here on a Saturday, I would think if we are being brought here on a Saturday in the middle of a pandemic, it is to help those millions of families who are struggling, Madam Speaker.

I would think if we are going to come here on a Saturday, it would be to help those millions of small businesses, the restaurants in south Louisiana and New Orleans that don't even know if they are going to open again because of where we are right now.

In this pandemic you would think that is what we would be here for.

But instead, Madam Speaker, why are we here?

For a fabricated crisis.

The Wall Street Journal: "NANCY PELOSI Goes Politically Postal. Congress ought to be embarrassed by this evidence-free conspiracy theory."

The New York Times: "I Was a Postal Service Regulator for 18 Years. Don't Panic. The service is perfectly capable of handling election mail." That was a Bill Clinton-era appointee.

Then you look at, again, this fabricated crisis that, oh my gosh, there are mailboxes being closed.

Let's look at the record. During the Obama-Biden years—just 4 years—11,560 mailboxes removed.

Where were the hearings for that?

Where were the Saturday votes to decry that they were closing mailboxes?

It never happened because it is not a real crisis.

Even the Postmaster General just testified yesterday: "The Postal Service is fully capable and committed to delivering the Nation's election mail fully and on time."

That is the Postmaster General.

If you would have listened to him—I know there is a hearing Monday. Maybe if you would have waited to see what he actually said Monday in this committee, Madam Speaker, you would have known that this is a fabricated crisis. But you knew that before.

Madam Speaker, they knew this was a fabricated crisis.

In fact, when we talk about the money, oh my gosh, the post office is going to run out of money. Well, the problem is the facts decry even that. They have got a surplus of over \$12 billion sitting in the bank today and then they have got—this is the Department of Treasury, Madam Speaker, a \$10 billion line of credit that they can't even access because they have too much money in the bank right now.

Imagine small businesses watching on a Saturday because they can't open. They are not even sure if they are going to be in business next week because they have no money in the bank, and they are hearing about this crisis. Congress is coming in on a Saturday.

Then they find out the post office has over \$12 billion in the bank and they have access to a line of credit of \$10 billion from Treasury that they can't get to today because they have got too much money in the bank.

Right now, it is here. This is the letter from Treasury.

It is so important, Madam Speaker, that 68 Democrats chose not even to show up today. Sixty-eight are not even here today because this is a fake crisis. It is a fabricated crisis.

It is a shame that instead of helping small businesses and families, they are trying to scare the American people when everybody knows there is enough money to carry out the mail. Barack Obama and Joe Biden took out over 11,000 mailboxes, and it was never even a problem.

We have got to vote against this.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY), who is the chair of the Subcommittee on Economic and Consumer Policy on the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise as a proud cosponsor of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act.

Madam Speaker, the USPS is under attack. In the last month, Postmaster General DeJoy has made irreversible changes causing mail delivery backlogs as long as 3 weeks. But don't just take my word for it; 1,612 constituents of mine have contacted us about delayed mail.

Denise Winchar contacted us saying: I run a small business and rely on the

post office to receive payment for my clients. Without payment, I have no income. Any delay in getting paid is a big hardship for me. In the past month, I have had to wait several weeks for payment.

Take Vanesa Deben's word for it. She says: My insurance forces us to get our prescription delivered by mail, I have diabetes and I need to take my meds or risk health problems. The USPS is a service that we all pay for with our taxes and as a paying customer we need to demand that we get our service back now.

The Delivering for America Act includes three important provisions, Madam Speaker.

It reverses the dangerous operational changes implemented by Postmaster DeJoy.

It includes \$25 billion in relief to the USPS.

It requires the USPS to treat all official election mail as first-class mail.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Since the election of President Trump, the most absurd conspiracy theories have been proclaimed as gospel by the entire Democratic Party and their media mouthpieces.

Let's begin with the Russian collusion hoax; the theory that Trump was a secret Russian agent who colluded with Putin to steal the 2016 election from Hillary Clinton. The theory comprised many preposterous sub-conspiracies, including several wild tales.

For example, secret computer servers communicated with Russians.

Secret meetings with Russians occurred in Prague, and secret Russian money laundering from the Trump campaign.

Best of all, Putin had a secret stash of nude pictures of Trump and the now infamous pee tapes that the Democrats and their puppets in the media spent several years searching all over Europe for.

The Russia hoax ultimately imploded. But, Madam Speaker, you have to almost admire the Democrats' amazing ability to jump from one debunked conspiracy theory to another without a hint of shame, embarrassment, or self-reflection.

The Democrats supposedly convened us here today to protect Americans from Trump's latest nefarious plot—his alleged attempt to sabotage the Postal Service to steal the election. In the grand scheme of Democratic conspiracy theories, this one really is scraping the bottom of the barrel.

I suppose we can grant the Democrats that the post office actually does exist, and it does deliver mail. But watching them vent outrage on social media about missing mailboxes and anti-mail theft devices is rather sad.

Good conspiracy theories have rich, false details that tell a story, like Area

51 for example. But the Democrats have grown a little lazy to develop the necessary back story.

The Postal Service hoax is more akin to theories that the Earth is flat, NASA faked Moon landings, that Elvis is alive, and that Paul McCartney is dead. Even the Loch Ness Monster, Big Foot, and the Chupacabra at least yielded photographic evidence.

In closing, I want to thank my Democratic colleagues for inviting us here for a Saturday afternoon matinee in August. I urge them next time to put more effort into their future conspiracy theories. If you no longer have time to properly craft your fake news narratives, you can also have the Democratic National Committee launder money to hire a British spy to go to your Russian friends and develop another set of fake dossiers.

Madam Speaker, have a good afternoon. I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1615

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), a distinguished Member of Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, for several years, I was a letter carrier, working my way through college and grad school, working overtime as mail volume necessitated—and, yes, necessitated. It was understood then that it was a necessity.

I worked with dedicated postal workers, many of whom were veterans who persevered through emergencies—hurricane, blizzards, floods. As the motto says, "gloom of night."

Now, our country faces new emergencies, a pandemic that threatens lives and encumbers our basic rights, like the right to vote safely and in an economic crisis, where 600,000 Postal Service workers battle back, providing economic stimulus and \$1.6 trillion in sales revenues.

The Postal Service is an economic and healthcare lifeline, a lifeline that Donald Trump is trying to sever, all to sabotage mail-in voting he thinks will dampen his chances to cling to power.

He is the gloom of night, and it is our job, our duty, to throw some sunlight his way and to stop him.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 8 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I was told in persuasion class many, many years ago that if you had a weak argument, you

shouted all the more. After hearing some of the leadership on the other side of the aisle, I guess they learned the same approach—a weak argument that isn't holding up.

When I heard the majority leader talk about "this is for the people," this is for "your people," I don't believe that at all because Jeanie, my rural mail carrier, is working today; 68 Democrats are not working today. Yet, this is supposed to be something of importance.

Last week, we heard the convention start this postal deal going on. This is just a continuation of the Democrat convention. I want you to know that nothing that has been said about supposedly what the President is attempting to do in defunding, in deflating, in stopping the vote or the mail service is true. My Democrat colleagues know that as well. I think that is why 68 chose to stay home today as opposed to coming here in a planned event that meant nothing other than politics.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, Postmaster General DeJoy's attempts to push forward operational changes that delay the mail are simply unacceptable. My constituents depend on the U.S. Postal Service. In the past week alone, I received over 1,000 constituent letters expressing confusion and anger over these changes that he has planned and implemented.

A senior from Coventry wrote to me, expressing her alarm over what might happen if her diabetic husband failed to receive his medications on time.

A constituent from Wakefield, who has not missed an election since 1956, emailed me to ask if he should vote in person, despite being 85 years old with health concerns.

Madam Speaker, no one should have to wait for lifesaving medications or risk their health to cast a vote. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Millions of Americans are counting on us, and we cannot let them down.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Kentucky for yielding.

Madam Speaker, look, I am pleased that Democrats here are upset about what has happened to the post office. My regret is, you didn't get upset during the Obama administration when they were shutting down our post offices, not just getting rid of 12,000 mailboxes, shutting down processing centers. In my district, when they shut down the Overton processing center, it meant mail going from Tyler to Longview, or vice versa, went to Dallas then to Shreveport and back.

The Deputy Attorney General came to my office—I had been demanding a meeting with the Postmaster General—

but, oh, no. No time for that. They had no decency. They tried to say 390 miles would be cheaper and quicker than going 30 miles.

It is an outrage what the Obama administration did, including their Postmaster General, who was in office until June 15 of this year.

Wake up. Let's complain about the post office during the Obama years.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, Mr. DeJoy was before a Senate committee on Friday. He was asked if he would put back in the sorters that he had removed, and he said no.

I think that is because he had already done his dirty work. He had already slowed down the mail by taking the sorting machines out, and the flat sorters as well, which my postal people tell me is causing great delays and will cause greater delays.

He had already done it. He refused to put them back in. Why? Because the job was done, and he didn't want to put those sorters back in to see that the mail was delivered. He is no Karl Malone. He does not deliver. He is not the "Mailman."

These postal sorters need to be there. 39,000 letters an hour go through. The flat sorters are necessary for the mail-in ballots. There is no reason he wouldn't put them back in. It wouldn't save any money. It costs money to take them out. He didn't save money by taking them out. He reduced efficiency. He reduced the ability of the Post Office to deliver ballots to elect a person safely in America. This is a shame, and it is a crime.

Madam Speaker, I support the bill, and everyone here should.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), my good friend.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Democrat bill entitled Delivering for America Act. What an irresponsible and dishonest title.

Democratic leadership must take the American people as fools. This bill attempts to deceive the American people by manufacturing a crisis that simply does not exist.

This bill also distracts this body from actually doing something in this Chamber that matters, like condemning violent mobs terrorizing our communities, like helping hardworking families across this country in this unprecedented time of need.

Madam Speaker, here are the facts: The United States Postal Service is a Blockbuster video in a Netflix world. Everyone knows it is a broken business model. It has failed its workers; it has failed its retirees; and it has failed the American taxpayers.

Despite the need for long-term reform, the Postal Service currently has

\$15 billion in cash on hand and \$10 billion more from the CARES Act.

The independent Postal Service Board and the independent Postmaster General have repeatedly assured the American people that they can handle the increased volume in mail-in voting.

Let's be clear. Today's vote is more political theater. It is another scene from the Democrats' one-act play titled Defeat President Trump at All Costs, even if it means peddling a deceitful narrative that undermines the American people's trust in the very institutions of our democratic Republic.

To say the Postal Service is all of a sudden incapacitated, unable to provide a secure, mail-in process, is not intellectually honest. It is downright predatory.

Democrats who falsely call into question the security of our elections to justify a \$25 billion bailout is a scam and a political payoff to their government union bosses.

Madam Speaker, I urge my Democrat colleagues: Stand up to your leadership. Stop this shameful charade. See the grave danger of manipulating the American people to score cheap, political points.

Madam Speaker, let's get back to work.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), the distinguished chair of the Asian Pacific American Caucus.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act, because I will not tolerate sabotage of the U.S. Postal Service.

This week, I went to my local post office to fight back against the attacks on mail delivery that my Republican colleagues now claim never happened. But I stand by those who know better than anyone, our country's postal workers.

They talked about how cuts to overtime are forcing mail carriers to abandon their routes halfway through, and how deliberate reductions to operating capacity mean that they cannot meet their community's needs.

My constituents also know better. Every day, I have heard from seniors whose medications have been delayed, small businesses unable to get orders to customers, and workers waiting to receive a check. Pharmacies in my district have even needed to tell customers to pick their medicine up in person instead of relying on the mail.

No one should have to risk exposure to COVID-19 just to pick up a prescription, especially not so the President can suppress votes in November.

Madam Speaker, vote to save the post office.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, over the last couple of hours, I have

heard my friends on the other side of the aisle say this is not serious. Do you know why this is serious? Madam Speaker, 176,000 dead Americans from COVID-19 and the projection that there may be 300,000 dead by December 1.

Madam Speaker, I left and got on a plane from a hotspot—14 to 20 percent infection. So my constituents who are suffering from stage IV cancer need the mail.

If they want the proof, I read the words of General Counsel and Executive Vice President Thomas J. Marshall of the U.S. Postal Service: "We are currently unable to balance our costs with available funding sources to fulfill both our universal service mission and other legal obligations."

The post office says they have no money. We need to be able to deliver this money to them and vote on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I support the bill and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in strong support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering For America Act.

I thank Chairwoman MALONEY for her leadership in drafting H.R. 8015.

As a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee and member of the House Budget Committee, I am particularly interested in why and how this Administration has tampered with the proper functioning of the U.S. Postal Service.

The drafters of the 1789 Constitution of the United States knew the vital importance of communication to the nation and its people, so they vested authority with the Congress to sustain and maintain a national postal service.

Article I, Section 8, clause 7, in the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress has the power "To establish Post Offices and post Roads . . ."

The Postal Clause was added to the Constitution to facilitate interstate communication as well as to create a source of revenue for the early United States.

The freedoms of the press and of speech are guaranteed in the First Amendment to the Constitution and the establishment of a national postal system, an authority vested by the Constitution in the Congress, are indispensable features of a strong and stable democracy.

A national postal system to collect and distribute mail efficiently, affordably, reliably, and without regard to the sender's or recipient's race, creed, color, national origin, religion, region of residence, or political affiliation strengthens and fortifies democracy by enabling all persons to communicate with any and all other Americans.

A functioning and effective national postal system strengthens the economy by facilitating the efficient delivery of goods and services, promotes the public health by facilitating the timely delivery of needed medical supplies and prescription drugs to senior citizens and veterans, and enriches civil society by facilitating the delivery of letters of greetings, sympathy, congratulations, and love, thus strengthening the mystic bonds of affection of Americans for each other and for the United States.

Fifty years after the Constitution went into effect the population of the United States ballooned at a greater rate than it has ever since.

During that period, the population grew from 3,929,214 in 1790, the year of the first census, to 17,069,453 in 1840.

For those who may think mail tampering is fine so long as it is an absentee ballot or absentee ballot request—they need to know that tampering with the U.S. mail is a federal felony.

Mail theft carries a penalty of up to five years in federal prison and fines of up to \$250,000 for each violation.

It is also a crime to injure, deface, or destroy any mail deposited in a mailbox.

For each act of vandalism, you could be imprisoned for up to three years and fined up to \$250,000.

Communication for the purpose of commerce, linking and strengthening bonds among family, and friends as well as keeping citizens informed was of the utmost importance to the health and wellbeing of the young democracy.

Over the centuries, the arrival of new technology that supported communication did not end the need for an affordable and easily accessible national postal service.

The telegraph, telephone nor the Internet ended the need for the delivery of letters, cards, packages, and newspapers or magazines.

The American people are depending on the House and the Senate, just like they depend on the Post Office to deliver a secure and voter centered November Election that empowers them to cast ballots for the candidates of their choice.

Election Day must not become a victim of COVID-19 through manipulation of the postal service or by any other means foreign or domestic.

I will work with my colleagues to ensure that all available means are provided to ensure that every voter, no matter their party or preference has access to cast a vote that will be counted in the November election.

For over 200 years, the American people have relied upon the National Postal Service to be there—no matter what—they have delivered the mail during a civil war, pandemics, hurricanes, forest fires, and terrorist attacks.

The Postal Service employs 633,108 of our friends and neighbors, including more than 100,000 veterans.

The Postal Service is one of the leading employers of minorities and women, with minorities comprising 39 percent and women comprising 40 percent of the workforce.

The Post Office has become a path to good paying jobs that lifts people out of poverty.

Postal workers have been determined to be essential workers during the pandemic and they have delivered service without complaint or fail during this national crisis.

As of July 2020, nearly 5,400 USPS employees tested positive for COVID-19 among its workforce of 630,000.

A May report stated that of the 130 Federal Employees who had died due to COVID-19, 60 of them were employed at the U.S. Postal Service.

In June, a staggering 17,000 workers, or 3 percent of the United States Postal Service workforce, had been quarantined since the start of the pandemic, according to a recent report by Government Executive magazine.

By the beginning of July, around 70 percent of those quarantined have been cleared to go back to work.

Earlier this summer Postal Service management acknowledged that 2,830 workers had tested positive for COVID-19, out of a total workforce of approximately 630,000.

However, USPS officials have not made publicly available the number of deaths.

With the urgent need to fix the postal service, we must not forget that the Postal Service employees are essential workers in COVID-19, and if they are essential it means that their work is essential.

For 55 cents, anyone can send a first class letter anywhere in the United States and there is no private sector mail service that can do this at this low price.

In 2019, the Postal Service:

Delivered 142.6 billion pieces of mail to 260 million addresses in America;

Delivered 1.2 billion prescriptions, including most of the medications ordered by the VA;

Served 70 percent of businesses with fewer than ten employees; and

Had a 90 percent favorability rating, making it the most popular federal agency.

The Postal Service:

Is often the only delivery option for rural America where service is not profitable;

Delivers 48 percent of the world's mail with one of the world's largest civilian vehicle fleets; and

Is a vital service for the more than 18 million seniors who do not use the Internet.

The Postal Service has become a pharmacy of choice for millions of Americans who live in pharmacy deserts, which are locations where there are no pharmacies to serve communities.

The Postal Service is an essential component to Veterans' and seniors' health because they deliver medicines to our veterans.

The VA has now confirmed to us that the United States Postal Service (USPS), which is responsible for delivering about 90 percent of all VA mail order prescriptions, has indeed been delayed in delivering these critical medications by an average of almost 25 percent over the past year, with many locations experiencing much more significant delays.

In addition to delivering prescriptions and business mail, they are also delivering democracy to millions of voters who will need to cast their ballot by mail this election year to reduce their risk of contracting COVID-19.

The U.S. mail service has provided essential mail service for absentee voting for well over 100 years by enabling Union troops to vote during the Civil War, World War I, World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, Iraqi Freedom, and to this day.

Since that time, absentee or not in-person voting has grown in popularity across the United States and is now a welcomed and valued component for assuring citizen participation in public elections.

In 2016, 20.9 percent of all votes cast in that federal election were done so by absentee ballots and this year that number is expected to be much higher due to COVID-19.

In 2018, there were 153.07 million people registered to vote in the United States, which is lower than the peak of 157.6 million registered voters in 2016.

Montana had the highest voter turnout rate with 45.6 percent for the 2020 presidential primary elections.

The voter turnout rate in Texas for the 2020 presidential primary elections was 21 percent.

More than 4 million Texans voted in the 2020 presidential primary election, with turnout

among Democratic voters at 12.81 percent compared to 12.39 percent of Republican voters.

In Texas, there were 16,211,198 registered voters and 4,084,431 votes for the 2020 primaries. In comparison, in 2016 there were 14,238,436 registered voters and 4,272,383 votes.

The attack on the viability and value of absentee voting should be viewed as just one component of many assaults on our elections system that may make this a very difficult election year.

Over the past several weeks, sweeping operational and organization changes at the Postal Service have resulted in delays in the mail across the country, including in rural communities, among veterans and seniors, and in blue and red states alike.

Some of those changes include curtailing overtime, restricting deliveries, eliminating sorting machines, and removing mailboxes.

Concerns have been raised by both Democratic and Republican officials at the federal, state and local levels.

These changes are being rushed through—in the midst of a global pandemic just months before the November elections—without adequate consultation with Congress, the Postal Board of Governors, the Postal Regulatory Commission, postal employees unions, state election officials, business organizations, and other stakeholders.

The Postmaster General also recently reassigned 23 postal executives in an overhaul that experts warn “deemphasizes decades worth of institutional postal knowledge” and “centralizes power around DeJoy.”

The restructure also proposed a hiring freeze, early retirements, unit realignments, and regional downscaling.

On August 11, 2020, the Postal Service's General Counsel sent a letter to Congress explaining that state election workers had been notified that paying Marketing Mail rates instead of First-Class rates for election mail “will result in slower delivery times and will increase the risk that voters will not receive their ballots in time to return them by mail.”

This breaks from the Postal Service's longstanding practice of prioritizing the delivery of all election mail to meet First-Class delivery times.

The 2011 Canadian RoboCon suppression scandal is the political scandal stemming from events during the 2011 Canadian federal election.

It involved robocalls and real-person calls that were designed to result in voter suppression.

Elections Canada and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police conducted investigations into the claims that calls were made to dissuade voters from casting ballots by falsely telling them that the location of their polling stations had changed.

Further possible electoral law violations were alleged as the evidence unfolded.

Under the Canada Elections Act, it is an offense to willfully prevent or endeavor to prevent an elector from voting in an election.

On Election Day, May 2, 2011, reports of voter suppression, mostly centered on the riding of Guelph, led to the discovery that a computer in the Guelph Conservative campaign office may have been used to make the calls.

While the Elections Canada investigation initially focused on calls sent into Guelph amidst

nationwide complaints, the investigation expanded to complaints in other ridings across the country.

Court documents filed in mid-August 2012 by the Commissioner of Canada Elections indicated that the elections watchdog had received complaints of fraudulent or misleading calls in 247 of Canada's 308 ridings, recorded in all ten provinces and at least one territory.

The deciding margin for control for the government was within the margin of error created by the fraudulent robocalls, which were successful in misdirecting voters resulting in them not being able to cast votes in that national election.

It is my strong view that we must prepare voters from all socioeconomic backgrounds and ethnic cultural experiences to be prepared to deal effectively with efforts to misinform them about their participation in the November Election.

We must focus on the unsuspecting among the voting population who have no idea what is coming their way and prepare them to meet that challenge by linking them to the election protection efforts to allow them to develop the needed resources so they are prepared to exercise the most precious of rights and do the work of citizenship by casting their votes for a government that serves We The People and works to make our union more perfect.

This view is shaped by the decades of elections filled with disinformation and misinformation tactics designed to suppress or repress black, LatinX, and young voters from voting or having their votes counted.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in support of H.R. 8015.

USPS Email from Constituent

Ms. Jennifer

SUBJECT: USPS concerns MESSAGE: First, thank you for having a "post office" category. Neither senator does. Second, this is ridiculous. The postmaster has conflicts of interest. He is dismantling the postal service, which is explicitly required by the constitution. I depend on the USPS as a constituent. My company depends on it for correspondence and service with clients, especially while we work from home due to Covid. My clients depend on it to get services and benefits. Please vote or act to hold the postmaster accountable and to stop these ridiculous changes he is making. They make no business sense for a "business", and they are unethical for a government-provided, constitutionally-mandated service.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman MALONEY for her leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act. Our courageous postal workers and letter carriers have been essential in keeping our country on track during this pandemic. More of us than ever are relying on the U.S. Postal Service to safely deliver medication and mail in a timely manner. But now, this handpicked Postmaster General is engineering an unconstitutional assault against the Postal Service from the inside out.

I saw it myself just yesterday in Charlotte. Mail sorting machines have

been reassembled and removed. Workers are being prohibited from working overtime. Letters and packages are piling up.

I was proud to help lead the charge of Chairwoman MALONEY, Chairman CONNOLLY, and Mr. DEFAZIO earlier this month in a letter we wrote to Speaker PELOSI. Now, I am proud to vote in favor of protecting the essential institution. The U.S. Postal Service has been delivering for us our entire lives. Now it is time that we deliver for them and for America.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 8015.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 4 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman MALONEY for her leadership.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to speak in strong support of the Delivering for America Act.

I have been here on the floor listening to this debate, and I have heard several of my Republican colleagues describe this as a manufactured crisis. Tell that to my constituents.

Tell that to Kelsey, a small business owner in Loveland, Colorado, who is worried about her ability to get packages delivered on time to her customers because of delays at the Postal Service.

Manufactured crisis? Tell that to Marsha, my constituent in Boulder, who depends on mail-order prescriptions, which this month took nearly 2 weeks to arrive.

This is not a manufactured crisis. There is a real crisis at the Postal Service under this Postmaster General, and we, here in the House, strive to fix it.

That is why I am a strong supporter of the bill that is before the House today, ultimately to ensure that the current standards of the Postal Service are protected and provide \$25 billion in emergency funding.

Let us get this done for the American people.

□ 1630

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is shameful and sinful that history will record that, on the great issues of our time, many of them, the Senate failed to act. On issues concerning life and death, the Senate of

the United States of America refused to act.

On the great issue of the HEROES Act, which has lifesaving implications—some 86,000 have died since it was passed—the Senate has failed to act.

On the issue of delivering lifesaving medications by way of the Postal Service, when the Postal Service needs our help, the Senate has refused to act.

And a Senate that refuses to act puts the actions of the House at risk, because the truth is this: It takes an act of Congress to help these entities; it takes an act of Congress to help the people of the United States of America; and you cannot get an act of Congress if the Senate refuses to act.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the chair of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise as a former letter carrier in support of H.R. 8015, to prevent the dangerous budget and service cuts proposed by Postmaster General DeJoy.

The Postmaster General claims he has not taken any steps to limit overtime for postal employees. His statement is hollow, because internal Postal Service documents show how policy changes prohibit "extra" or "late" trips, which means you finish delivering the mail in your bag that day, and they mandate that carriers "return on time," which means they can't finish the job.

In normal times, the Postal Service is crucial, but during a pandemic, on-time and efficient mail delivery is a matter of life and death.

Today's legislation will not just protect the Postal Service, but, given that people's homes are now polling places, the service protects the very essence of our democracy.

Don't mess with USPS.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, we see across the country the dismantling of the Postal Service, which has been a lifeline in American life.

My constituents are terrified, and they are angry because they are not receiving their medications on time; delays are hurting our small businesses; and they are outraged that their constitutional right to vote could be taken away.

This is not only an attack on our democracy but also on our workforce heroes, who, in spite of the pandemic, deliver our mail. Forty percent of these heroes are people of color. My grandfather retired as a letter carrier after 35 years of service.

I urge an “aye” vote to support, rather than to destroy, our Postal Service.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, despite the passionate arguments made by supporters of H.R. 8015, the truth is simple: The new Postmaster General is not trying to sabotage the election. He is doing the exact opposite. In fact, he is ensuring that States are educated on the reality of the Postal Service operations so that enough time is given for American citizens to vote by mail if they choose to do so.

Just yesterday, the Board of Governors announced a bipartisan committee to focus on election mail issues. Voting by mail is a crucial way that American citizens can exercise their constitutional right to vote, and it is important that all ballots be counted.

The Postal Service will be able to handle an increase in mail volume ahead of the election as they have already handled a larger volume of Census forms and stimulus checks earlier this year.

This increase in mail will also bring in revenue, strengthening the U.S. Postal Service’s fiscal outlook. Let’s not forget that the Postal Service already has approximately \$15 billion in cash on hand, which will allow it to be operational through August of 2021. It also has a \$10 billion line of credit from the CARES Act that it has not drawn down.

The USPS clearly does not need a bailout for the 2020 election season. To provide these funds without a concrete business reform plan that modernizes the post office for long-term viability would be reckless.

We all want to see an operational, efficient Postal Service that best serves every American. My grandmother was a rural mail carrier for 27 years. As both her grandson and as a Representative elected by rural Kentuckians, I know firsthand the importance of a reliable Postal Service in helping small businesses thrive, ensuring Americans get their medications on time, and allowing folks to share greeting cards with loved ones.

Americans deserve an improved Postal Service, but this bill potentially makes things worse.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, delivering the mail and medications and ballots, this is a part of our Constitution. It is important to our democracy.

And numbers don’t lie. This internal report from the Postal Service shows that services are down 10 percent since this Postmaster General took charge.

I want to publicly thank the Speaker of this great body for her leadership and for calling this emergency meeting and emergency vote. And there was no change in service until she called the meeting and vote.

I thank you for standing up to the American people and fighting for their

services and their democracy and their vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the United States Congress, the first woman in history, as we celebrate the 100th anniversary of women gaining the right to vote.

We are so proud of you and your leadership.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her kind words of introduction, but I most importantly want to thank her for being the champion, the champion in defense of the Postal Service. I rise to join her in support of the Delivering for America Act, to protect lives, livelihood, and the life of our American democracy during a critical moment for our Nation.

I thank you, Madam Chair, again, for the intellectual resource you have been in shaping the legislation, for making us current in terms of the reports from the Postal Service, what is at stake, and why this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is so important.

I salute House Democrats for their enthusiasm, energy, and insistence on delivering for America. Since day one of the postal crisis, they have conveyed the concerns of their communities to Congress, holding events, accelerating a drumbeat, and shining light on this crisis.

I am going to talk about three things, Mr. Speaker and Madam Chair and Mr. Ranking Member. This is about the provenance of the postal system and how important it has been to America, also what the challenges are in delaying service and, therefore, why this legislation is so necessary.

First, let me say that, in the Constitution of the United States, it says that Congress shall have the power to establish post offices and post roads, Article I, Section 8. So the post office is there in the Constitution.

But even before that, it has been a pillar of American democracy. It is an all-American institution, which enjoys the overwhelming support of the American people for a reason. Again, enshrined in the Constitution, an inseparable part of our national story, helping transition America from colonies to country.

In the early 1770s, our Founders relied on the precursor of the Postal Service, the Committees of Correspondence, to educate people about the abuses of the British and to build support for independence.

Even before the Declaration of Independence was signed, the Continental Congress had established the Postal Service as one of the first and most important offices that would be part of the new government.

Two of our U.S. Presidents, Abraham Lincoln and Harry Truman, would proudly hold the title of postmaster. One of our Founders, Benjamin Franklin, was the Postmaster General. Actually, he established the Postal Service.

So this goes to the heart of our country and the connection that the Postal

Service, throughout our history, from the very start, has been in tying our country together.

In the early 19th century, when visiting America to write his great book, “Democracy in America,” Alexis de Tocqueville praised the Postal Service as being the great link between minds, writing that not “in the most enlightened rural districts of France there is an intellectual movement either so rapid or on such a scale as” this, as the Postal Service.

So it has been excellent from the start, part of the unity of America.

As we all know, the postal motto states: “Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.”

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to ensure that those courageous couriers are not stayed from their constitutional duty to serve the American people.

I join you, Madam Chair, in saluting the patriotic men and women who risk their health and safety to serve the American people every day: our postal workers, our letter carriers, and all who may bring us together.

There is a second postal motto inscribed above the original Washington, D.C., Post Office, and this is really so clearly what the Postal Service has been about:

Messenger of Sympathy and Love
Servant of Parted Friends
Consoler of the Lonely
Bond of the Scattered Family
Enlarger of the Common Life
Carrier of News and Knowledge
Instrument of Trade and Industry
Promoter of Mutual Acquaintance
Of Peace and of Goodwill Among Men and Nations.

Our Postal Service is the beautiful thread that connects our country, delivering sympathy and love, news and knowledge, peace and goodwill. And as a grandmother, I will say, we have seen our children and grandchildren write their letters to Santa; we have seen messages come from the tooth fairy; we have seen photos and drawings of families taking joy in each other that no amount of social media can convey.

So, again, we must honor their service with our full support and protection and gratitude for what they mean in our lives.

Today, the Postal Service—and this is why this is so important that we have this legislation—provides critical services for Americans in every corner of the country: for our workers, delivering paychecks and tax returns; for our seniors, ensuring Social Security benefits; for small businesses, providing shipping and essential services; for millions of Americans, particularly rural Americans, delivering 1.2 billion prescriptions, including most of the medications delivered by the VA.

In 2019, 1.2 billion prescriptions were delivered by the Postal Service, and that was before the coronavirus hit.

□ 1645

That was before the coronavirus hit.

And for voters: Delivering absentee ballots and election mail, which is essential, especially during the coronavirus epidemic. No one should be forced to choose between his or her health and the right to vote.

Across the Nation, though, the Postmaster General is pushing sweeping new operational changes that degrade service, delay the mail, and threaten to disenfranchise voters, particularly in communities of color.

Now the Postmaster says he will postpone any further changes until after the election, that is what he says. But this is about more than the election. This legislation is written in a timely fashion to be about the coronavirus, and these changes should be there until the end of January or the end of the raging epidemic, whichever is later.

It is in that regard that I rise as Speaker to support the legislation. But as a representative of my district where I am not called Madam Speaker, I am called NANCY, this is what they have told me.

Michael said, he is a veteran with epilepsy. He reports that prescriptions sent by the VA through the mail are taking twice as long to arrive.

Walker says, he is a senior with debilitating health conditions, is now struggling to send and receive his mail after his closest mailbox was suddenly removed.

Claire, an 83-year-old with serious chronic illness, who does not have a car and is afraid to use public transport during the pandemic, is in a panic because she is utterly dependent on USPS for her medication and other vital deliveries, and of course, her ballot.

Another San Franciscan, Charlotte, warns that the Postal Service is vital to our country, not only when it comes to mail and voting, but also for fundamental needs of Americans.

And as Mark, another constituent, puts it, not only does what Trump is doing put the integrity of the November elections at risk; people are suffering every day, and they are not receiving their critical medications.

That is what I am hearing from my constituents, and they are told to go to the drug store. Well, they really can't in some cases. It endangers them to go to the drugstore, instead of getting it through the mail. Go to the drugstore.

So, again, this is immediate in their lives. We are their representatives. That is our job title and our job description. In representing my constituents, I wanted to convey some samples of concern that we have heard.

Earlier this week, in response to the activism of the American people, people have risen up, I have never seen anything quite like it. The Postmaster General announced changes that are wholly insufficient and do not reverse damage already wreaked. He said to me, frankly—and I have to give him credit for his honesty—he said, I have no intention of replacing the sorting

machines that were removed from the post offices;

I have no intention of replacing the blue mailboxes that have been ripped from our neighborhoods; and

He has no plans for ensuring adequate overtime, which is critical, critical for the timely delivery of the mail.

He said he has no intention of treating ballots as first-class mail. Now, yesterday he said something different, but that is what he told me a couple of days ago.

And I said to him, We will have the provision in the bill that requires you treat ballots as first-class mail. And he said, Well, if it is in the bill, then I will have to do it. Hence, his change of attitude.

He has not adequately addressed America's concerns about the slowdown and the delivery of medicine to veterans. He just didn't even seem to know about it. Really?

Today, Chairwoman MALONEY released new internal post office documents that expose the severity of the service declines and delivery delays caused by the Postmaster General's drastic changes.

These documents make clear that the Postmaster General has deliberately misled Congress and the American people about the extent of the damage, brushing them off as a dip in service or as unintended consequences. These revelations show that we cannot have confidence that the Postmaster General is prioritizing the Postal Service or the millions who rely on it.

Now, the House is moving forward with a, hopefully, bipartisan vote, and I think it will be, on Delivering for America Act, which will reverse the Trump damage and provided \$25 billion to the United States Postal Service.

Sadly, the administration has already threatened to veto this legislation, which contains the same amount of funding, the \$25 billion, that was recommended by the United States Postal Service Board of Governors. They are bipartisan. They are 100 percent appointed by Donald Trump, and they unanimously recommended the \$25 billion that is contained in this bill.

So for the sake of every senior who is delayed in getting his or her Social Security check, every veteran who is delayed in getting his or her medication, every working family who is delayed in getting their paycheck, and every voter now facing the prospect of choosing between their vote and their health, we need to pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I urge a strong bipartisan vote for H.R. 8015, the Delivery for America Act. Let's pass this under the leadership of distinguished Chairwoman MALONEY for the people.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8015.

This upcoming 2020 general election will be like no other we have witnessed. Americans

will cast their vote to elect a new government amidst a dangerous pandemic that has devastated countless American families. To date, over 170,000 Americans have died due to COVID-19 and over 5.6 million Americans have been infected. The pandemic has disrupted our health, economy and our way of life, including our democratic traditions. Americans are rightfully worried about how to safely cast their vote this November.

Public health experts agree that voters will be empowered to protect themselves and their families by having safe voting options, which includes absentee voting. Having the option to vote by mail ensures that voters who cannot vote in person don't have to choose between their health and their right to vote.

The engine of voting by mail is the United States Postal Service. In every election, postal workers provide an essential service to our democracy by processing and delivering millions of absentee ballots for domestic, overseas and military voters. This November, several million Americans will depend on the Postal Service to exercise their right to vote.

But in recent months, new leadership at the Postal Service directed drastic operational policy changes that disrupted mail processing and slowed mail delivery nationwide. The impact of the delays has been harmful to Americans, especially senior citizens, veterans and the sick, who depend on the Postal Service to receive medications, retirement checks and other essentials. Former Postal Service executives, election administrators and voter advocacy groups have warned that ongoing delays in mail services will likely disenfranchise voters that will cast absentee ballots this November.

The Delivering for America Act will work to restore prompt and reliable mail delivery services to the American people. The bill rolls back the recent disruptive operational changes at the Postal Service and prohibits the Postal Service from implementing any further changes that will delay mail and reduce delivery standards.

The bill also works to protect access to absentee voting and prevent voter disenfranchisement caused by delayed mail. It does this by ensuring that all election mail, including absentee ballots, will be treated as first-class mail, and will receive a postmark, or other indicia indicating date of receipt. In addition to protecting the absentee voting system, these changes will help maintain trust and confidence in the Postal Service.

And lastly, the bill will appropriate much needed funding support to the Postal Service in the amount of \$25 billion which will help ensure the long-term financial stability of the agency, and was requested by the Board of Governors appointed by President Donald Trump.

As November 3rd nears, and the COVID-19 pandemic continues to threaten American life and health, our duty today, as representatives of the American people, is to safeguard the American people's right to essential mail services and the right to vote. The Delivering for America Act, if enacted, will put into the place the necessary measures to ensure we fulfill this duty, and so I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service is a lifeline to rural communities. While some Americans have had the opportunity to work from home during this

pandemic, our letter carriers and postmasters do not. They're working tirelessly to ensure people in every corner of the country are getting their mail and packages, which for our at-risk population, has been especially critical.

I've been supportive of the \$25 billion in emergency funding included in this legislation and I'm relieved that at the urging of members like myself and the postal workers, a dangerous private right of action provision, which would have allowed trial lawyers to take advantage of the 2020 election, was removed.

As someone who has worked across the aisle to support the Postal Service, I was disappointed when it recently became a political weapon.

We should not be politicizing the Postal Service and in turn, the thousands of hard-working employees that serve each of our districts.

As Ranking Member of House Administration, I'll tell you that, while I'm supportive of this bill, it is not going to solve our election administration problems.

Despite early warnings from the Postal Service, at least eighteen states still have ballot request and return policies that are incompatible with their delivery standards, which significantly increases the risk of disenfranchising voters.

We saw hundreds of thousands of ballots during recent primaries across the country go uncounted for this very issue. NPR estimates nearly a half a million were rejected—disproportionately disenfranchising minority and younger voters.

Despite early warnings from the Postal Service, unrealistic ballot request and return policies continue to be one of the biggest impediments to ensuring every vote is counted.

A recent poll found 59 percent of Americans still prefer to vote in person, yet there's nothing in this bill to help states allow people to safely go to the polls.

So I'm not voting for this bill because I think the post office is trying to sabotage our elections. I'm voting for this bill because we're in the middle of a pandemic, the Postal Service is vital to our society, and they need our help.

And while I'm glad we're back here for a special session to help the Postal Service, I wish we were also voting on a deal to help our schools, small businesses, and the millions of people still out of work because of the pandemic.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Delivering for America Act (H.R. 8015), which would restore normal U.S. Postal Service (USPS) operations and prohibit the Trump Administration from implementing or approving any changes that would impede service during the COVID-19 pandemic. The bill also provides \$25 billion in emergency funding, matching the level requested by the bipartisan Board of Governors, and which the House passed as part of the Heroes Act in May.

For over two and a half centuries, our nation's Postal Service has stood as an independent, neutral entity focused solely on connecting Americans and providing essential services. This independence has allowed the Postal Service to maintain its status as the country's most trusted government agency for decades.

Over the past several weeks, the Trump Administration has turned the Postal Service into an instrument of partisan politics by enabling

Postmaster General DeJoy to implement harmful and unprecedented operational and service changes at the Postal Service, such as reducing overtime, restricting deliveries, and eliminating sorting machines and mailboxes. These actions have resulted in unacceptable wait times for mail across the country, delaying timely delivery of prescription medication and other vital mail, and endangering our upcoming election.

Following heavy criticism, the Postmaster General issued a wholly insufficient and misleading pause in operational changes. But it is now clear after his testimony before the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, that he has no intention of taking meaningful action to reverse the damage that the Postmaster General's sweeping changes have inflicted. Additionally, the pause does nothing to ensure voters that their election ballots will be delivered in time if they mail their ballots account to their state's deadlines. Finally, the pause is only temporary, and the damaging changes are set to return after the election. Two weeks ago, I called for the Postmaster General to resign. Today, I repeat that call and stand firm that he must step down.

The Trump Administration's efforts to sabotage the Postal Service have endangered the lives and livelihoods of millions who rely on the USPS for essential services like delivering life-saving medications, medical equipment, Social Security benefits and paychecks. The Postmaster General's decision to impose these dangerous changes in the middle of an ongoing pandemic has magnified the disruption of many of these vital services.

The use of mail-order prescriptions, for instance, has increased by 20 percent during the pandemic. Due to the degradation of service, mail-order medications are reportedly taking weeks to be delivered, forcing patients to skip doses of life-saving medicines. Veterans throughout the country have reportedly faced wait times of three weeks or more for mail-order medications, which has left the Department of Veterans Affairs scrambling to find alternative delivery services.

Stopping these changes and reversing the damage already done is not enough. We must provide the additional funding in this bill to ensure services continue uninterrupted through the election and the pandemic. But in the President's own words, he opposes any emergency funding because he believes that without it, the Postal Service will not be able to handle the estimated influx of mail-in ballots in the upcoming general election. The President himself has voted by mail in the last three elections but continues to attack mail-in voting as rife with fraud. In reality, voting fraud of all forms is extremely rare, and that's especially true with mail-in voting, whose fraud rates are immeasurably small. Oregon, the first state to expand mail-in ballots to general elections, has sent out more than 100 million mail-in ballots since 2000, and has documented less than a dozen cases of fraud.

With the number of Americans voting by mail for the election expected to more than double from the last due to the pandemic, Congress must protect the right of every American to vote. If Congress fails to act, we risk permanent damage to the integrity of our elections and our government institutions; we risk the livelihoods of farmers and workers around this country who rely on the USPS;

and we risk the health and lives of our seniors, veterans, and millions of other patients who rely on mail-order medications during a pandemic that has now claimed the lives of nearly 175,000 people in the U.S. Finally, we risk the disenfranchisement of seniors and other higher-risk individuals whose safest option is casting mail-in ballots.

Protecting the integrity of the Postal Service should never be a partisan issue. Congress must pass the Delivering for America Act, and work quickly to reverse the substantial damage inflicted by the Trump Administration.

I urge my colleagues to vote Yay and the Senate to take up this bill immediately.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, at a time when the United States Postal Service is needed more than ever before, I am proud to stand in support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act.

Ahead of the November elections, we must focus all efforts and resources to ensure that voting is safe, fair, and accessible for all. That's why I am pleased that the Delivering for America Act includes a requirement for election mail to be considered first-class, a ban on the removal of mail sorting machines, and a total reversal of any policies hindering the delivery of mail.

Election mail is not the only mail impacted by the recent changes. In my district, I have heard stories from my constituents about delays in delivery for vital medications, bills, and other important packages through the mail. At a time when seniors and those with preexisting conditions are unable to go out in public to pharmacies, or when those who lost their jobs see the bills piling up, timely deliveries should be the least of their worries.

This past week, I had the opportunity to meet with the Dallas County Postal Service and Union leaders to address the role of the federal government in protecting the processes, operations, and service standards for the USPS. There, I was glad to hear that everything was running up to speed thanks to the hardworking men and women—who risk their health day in and day out—to guarantee that our mail is delivered.

The USPS boasts one of the most diverse workforces in the country. In Texas, African Americans and Latinos make up a significant percentage of employees, and more than 50 percent are women. Because minority communities are disproportionately affected by COVID-19, proper PPE is necessary for their safety—which this bill provides funding for. It also prohibits a restriction on the use of overtime pay for USPS employees and prevents the institution of a hiring freeze, to ensure that they are equitably compensated for their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure and hope for its immediate consideration in the Senate.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act. This legislation will put a stop to Postmaster General Louis DeJoy's sabotage of the U.S. Postal Service and help reverse the damage that has already been done. H.R. 8015 will prohibit operational or service changes during the COVID public health emergency and ensure the level of service that was in place on January 1, 2020. The bill also includes \$25 billion to help shore up postal operations that have been badly impacted by the pandemic.

I have been deeply disturbed by recent operational and organizational changes at USPS designed to sabotage mail delivery service ahead of our 2020 presidential election. In his brief tenure as Postmaster General, Mr. DeJoy—a major contributor to the President's reelection campaign—has pushed through sweeping changes to mail delivery processes and procedures, dismantled vital mail sorting equipment, and undertaken a major restructuring intended to sideline career postal officials. This nakedly partisan attempt to subvert democracy and undermine confidence in the integrity of our election process is unconscionable and unacceptable. The Postmaster General should be ashamed of himself.

The USPS is a vital lifeline to millions of people across our country, especially now. Veterans and seniors rely on the mail to get prescriptions, people are staying connected with loved ones through mail while sheltering at home, and more voters will cast their ballots by mail this year than ever before. Fast, reliable postal service is critical to providing these essential services. Yet, my office has received numerous complaints of late or inconsistent mail service since the Postmaster General's changes went into effect. One constituent, a senior from Napa, wrote to me afraid her necessary medication would be useless by the time it arrived. The medication, which is temperature sensitive and usually takes 2–3 days to deliver, hadn't shown up in more than 10.

Our letter carriers are dedicated to providing our communities the highest level of service. Since the founding of our Post Office, they have lived by the motto: "Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." The Delivering for America Act will help ensure postal employees can keep this oath. That's why I am proud to support and to be a coauthor of the legislation. I urge a yes vote.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our Postal Service and in support of its mission to serve our people, in support of its role in our democracy, in our elections, in support of its role in delivering vital goods and services critical to the health and well-being of our people and our economy and in support of the men and women of the Postal Service who have added the pandemic to the list of barriers they cast aside each day in their daily rounds.

Mr. Speaker, I note that we do not require that our government departments and agencies show a "profit." That is not their purpose. We do not defend our country for a "profit." We do not educate our children for a "profit." We do not protect our environment for a "profit."

Mr. Speaker, we long ago rejected the Luddite movement which advocated breaking machines in a futile effort to turn back scientific and technological progress. Breaking and discarding postal sorting machines is sabotage today, just as it was in the 1800s.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by the alarming delays in First-Class, marketing, and Priority Mail documented by the Postal Service's own briefing packet for the Postmaster General from last week. I have seen evidence of these delays in the pictures sent and the stories told to me by postal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly cast my vote in support of the request from the Postal Board of

Governors for \$25 billion in aid and in support of H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1092, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COMER moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 8015, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add after section 2(c) the following:

(d) PENALTIES FOR POSTAL SERVICE EMPLOYEE FEDERAL ELECTION TAMPERING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An employee of the United States Postal Service may be subject to disciplinary action consisting of removal, reduction in grade, debarment from Federal employment for a period not to exceed 5 years, suspension, or reprimand if the employee—

(A) knowingly and willfully obstructs or retards the passage of election mail products, or any carrier or conveyance carrying election mail products; or

(B) uses his official authority for the purpose of interfering with, or affecting, the nomination or the election of any candidate for Federal office.

(2) APPLICATION.—Paragraph (1) shall apply to any act that would be a violation of such paragraph taken on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

In section 3, add at the end after the period the following: "Such funds may only be used for operating expenses and may not be used to pay any outstanding debt of the Postal Service: *Provided further*, That during the COVID-19 emergency, the Postal Service shall use a portion of such funds to prioritize the delivery of postal products for ballots related to Federal election mail and medical or pharmaceutical delivery purposes and may establish temporary delivery points, in such form and manner as the Postal Service determines necessary, to protect employees of the Postal Service and individuals receiving deliveries from the Postal Service."

Mr. COMER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have shown immense passion today for both their constituents and the integrity of this upcoming national election. There is no doubt that voting by mail will be

more relied upon than it has been in previous elections.

The Postal Service will be a crucial link in the chain of custody between voters and State or local election boards. For the Americans who choose to cast their vote via mail, they need to be sure that their ballot, their voice, will be safe. We, therefore, need the proper measures in place to ensure that integrity is maintained.

In addition, if we are going to give the Postal Service funding, I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle need assurances that it will be spent where Americans need it more. The prioritization of medical deliveries and ballots for this election.

My motion contains reasonable additions to H.R. 8015 that ensure that this funding gets to where it needs to go. These provisions ensure that funds must only be spent on operating expenses to keep our postal workers paid and to keep them safe with personal protective equipment.

These provisions will also ensure that a portion of these funds go to prioritizing pharmaceutical deliveries to get life-saving medicines to Americans quicker. Lastly, these provisions ensure that these funds are used to prioritize ballots as well as establish penalties for postal employees who tamper or interfere with election mail.

For instance, any postal employee will face penalties if they knowingly and willfully slow down the processing of mail or use their official authority to interfere with the election of a Federal candidate. This upcoming election will put millions, possibly hundreds of millions of votes, in the literal hands of Postal Service workers who we must trust to deliver ballots safely and on time.

The election will put our collective faith in our Postal Service like we have never seen before, and those who break the trust of the Americans need to face the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, obviously, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not aware that fraud is a Federal—voter fraud is a crime. We have already established and funded the United States Postal Inspection Service.

Little do they know, whenever an employee is in a postal facility, there are internal galleys in every facility where you are observed for 24 hours a day by postal inspectors. Mr. Speaker, I am very comfortable that we will adhere to those laws. We have clerks who have sworn duties to protect elections.

But let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, 3 months ago this House passed the HEROES Act, and I ask my colleagues to

open their mail because we sent them a letter that will protect the Postal Service. We sent them a letter saying that we need to send funding to the States and local governments so they will not defund the police departments.

If you want to know who is defunding the police department, the lack of a movement in the Senate to send that necessary money to cities who must balance their budget. And the only way they can balance their budget is to cut because they don't have the funding that has been taken away from them because of COVID.

So you have the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have on their hands the defunding of our police department. I wanted, too, to be very clear that we have heard repeatedly that the Democrats had manufactured a crisis at the expense of this President, and that the emergency funding is "an unnecessary bailout plan."

We do not need to help the current President to create a crisis. We have seen every single day statements from the White House about what we are doing and what we should not do with the Postal Service. I want everyone here to know that every postal employee takes an oath that they will adhere to the Constitution, that they will serve and protect.

The majority of the postal workers are veterans who have served in the military, who continue their service in the Postal Service. I want it to be very clear that this election that is being held hostage right now by the Postal Service's internal decisions to tear it apart, where you have over 600,000 employees reporting to work who want to uphold their oath of office.

I want to say today, Mr. Speaker, that the Postal Service motto is neither rain, snow, heat or gloom of night you will not deter these carriers from their mission. And we are standing here today saying, no. Return to sender this unnecessary MTR. That we, as Democrats, we are putting forth this bill to ensure that we are not in that place where we are going to try to deter the Postal Service from doing their job.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to wake up, to understand that this is not a Democrat or Republican issue, because the ballots that are going to be moving through the Postal Service, some of them may even go to them, they better protect the Postal Service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 223, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—182

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gianforte
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)

NAYS—223

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy

Gooden
Gosar
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzer
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes

Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Tomborn
Torres Small
(NM)
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui

McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes

NOT VOTING—25

Amodei
Brooks (IN)
Collins (GA)
Cook
Diaz-Balart
Flores
Gabbard
Gibbs
Granger

□ 1754

Messrs. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, DEUTCH, JEFFRIES, Mr. SCANLON, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Miss RICE of New York changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GOSAR changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)
Barragán (Beyer)
Bera (Aguilar)
Blumenauer
(Beyer)
Bonamici
(Raskin)
Brownley (CA)
(Clark (MA))
Cárdenas
(Gomez)
Case
(Cartwright)
Clay (Davids
(KS))
Costa (Cooper)
Davis (CA) (Wild)
DeGette (Blunt
Rochester)
DeBene (Heck)

DeSaulnier
(Matsui)
Doggett (Raskin)
Engel (Pallone)
Escobar (Garcia
(TX))
Foster (Beyer)
Frankel (Clark
(MA))
Garamendi
(Sherman)
Gonzalez (TX)
(Gomez)
Grijalva (García
(IL))
Hastings
(Wasserman
Schultz)
Horsford (Kildee)
Huffman (Kildee)

Jayapal (Raskin)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Kennedy
(Deutch)
Khanna (Gomez)
Kind (Beyer)
Kirkpatrick
(Gallego)
Kuster (NH)
(Clark (MA))
Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Lowey (Tonko)

McNerney (Raskin)
 Meng (Clark (MA))
 Moore (Beyer)
 Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman Schultz)
 Nadler (Jeffries)
 Napolitano (Correa)
 Omar (Pressley)
 Panetta (Kildee)
 Pascrell (Pallone)
 Payne (Wasserman Schultz)

Peters (Rice (NY))
 Peterson (Vela)
 Pingree (Clark (MA))
 Porter (Wexton)
 Price (NC) (Butterfield)
 Rooney (FL) (Beyer)
 Roybal-Allard (McCollum)
 Ruiz (Aguilar)
 Rush (Underwood)
 Sánchez (Aguilar)
 Schakowsky (Kelly (IL))

Schneider (Houlahan)
 Serrano (Jeffries)
 Sires (Pallone)
 Speier (Scanlon)
 Thompson (CA) (Kildee)
 Titus (Connolly)
 Visclosky (Raskin)
 Watson Coleman (Pallone)
 Welch (McGovern)
 Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Reed
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rose (NY)
 Rouda
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider

Schrader
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Pocan
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Speier
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Stefanik
 Stevens
 Stivers
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib

Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres Small (NM)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Turner
 Underwood
 Upton
 Van Drew
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth
 Young

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes due to circumstances beyond my control. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 179, “nay” on rollcall No. 180, “yea” on rollcall No. 181, and “nay” on rollcall No. 182.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, due to a long-standing prior commitment, I was unable to return for votes on Saturday, August 22. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 179 (PQ); “nay” on rollcall No. 180 (Rule); “yea” on rollcall No. 181 (MTR); and “nay” on rollcall No. 182 (H.R. 8015).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, under the advice of my physician, due to a bulging disk in my back, I could not get on a plane to return to Washington to vote on H.R. 8015, the Delivering for America Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 179, “nay” on rollcall No. 180, “yea” on rollcall No. 181, and “nay” on rollcall No. 182.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend today's roll call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 179, “nay” on rollcall No. 180, “yea” on rollcall No. 181, and “nay” on rollcall No. 182.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on August 22, 2020 due to not being in DC. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “no” on rollcall No. 179; “no” on rollcall No. 180; “yes” on rollcall No. 181; and “no” on rollcall No. 182.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)	Huffman (Kildee)	Peters (Rice (NY))
Barragan (Beyer)	Jayapal (Raskin)	Peterson (Vela)
Bera (Aguilar)	Johnson (TX)	Pingree (Clark (MA))
Blumenauer (Beyer)	(Jeffries)	Porter (Wexton)
Bonamici (Raskin)	Kennedy (Deutch)	Price (NC) (Butterfield)
Brownley (CA)	Khanna (Gomez)	Kirkpatrick (Aguilar)
(Clark (MA))	Kind (Beyer)	Rooney (FL) (Beyer)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Kirkpatrick (Gallo)	Roybal-Allard (McCollum)
Case (Cartwright)	Kuster (NH)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Clay (Davids (KS))	(Clark (MA))	Rush (Underwood)
Costa (Cooper)	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez (Aguilar)
Davis (CA) (Wild)	(Evans)	Schakowsky (Kelly (IL))
DeGette (Blunt Rochester)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Schneider (Houlahan)
DelBene (Heck)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Serrano (Jeffries)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Sires (Pallone)
Doggett (Raskin)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Speier (Scanlon)
Engel (Pallone)	Lowey (Tonko)	Thompson (CA) (Kildee)
Escobar (Garcia (TX))	McNerney (Raskin)	Titus (Connolly)
Foster (Beyer)	Meng (Clark (MA))	Visclosky (Raskin)
Frankel (Clark (MA))	Moore (Beyer)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Garamendi (Sherman)	Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman Schultz)	Welch (McGovern)
Gonzalez (TX) (Gomez)	Nadler (Jeffries)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Grijalva (Garcia (IL))	Napolitano (Correa)	
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Omar (Pressley)	
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)	Panetta (Kildee)	
Horsford (Kildee)	Pascrell (Pallone)	
	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 257, nays 150, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—257

Adams	DelBene	Kim
Aguilar	Delgado	Kind
Allred	Demings	King (NY)
Axne	DeSaulnier	Kirkpatrick
Bacon	Deutsch	Krishnamoorthi
Balderson	Dingell	Kuster (NH)
Barragan	Doggett	LaMalfa
Bass	Doyle, Michael F.	Lamb
Beatty	Engel	Langevin
Bera	Escobar	Larsen (WA)
Beyer	Eshoo	Larson (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Españat	Lawrence
Blumenauer	Evans	Lawson (FL)
Blunt Rochester	Finkenaue	Lee (CA)
Bonamici	Fitzpatrick	Lee (NV)
Bost	Fletcher	Levin (CA)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Fortenberry	Levin (MI)
Brindisi	Foster	Lieu, Ted
Brown (MD)	Frankel	Lipinski
Brownley (CA)	Fudge	Loeb sack
Buchanan	Galleo	Lofgren
Bustos	Garamendi	Lowenthal
Butterfield	Garcia (IL)	Lowe
Carbajal	Garcia (TX)	Lujan
Cárdenas	Golden	Luria
Carson (IN)	Gomez	Lynch
Cartwright	Gonzalez (TX)	Malinowski
Case	Gottheimer	Maloney
Casten (IL)	Graves (MO)	Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean
Castor (FL)	Green, Al (TX)	Matsui
Castro (TX)	Grijalva	McAdams
Chu, Judy	Haaland	McBath
Cicilline	Harder (CA)	McCauley
Cisneros	Hastings	McCollum
Clark (MA)	Hayes	McEachin
Clarke (NY)	Heck	McGovern
Clay	Herrera Beutler	McKinley
Cleaver	Higgins (NY)	McNerney
Clyburn	Himes	Meeks
Cohen	Horn, Kendra S.	Meng
Connolly	Horsford	Mfume
Cooper	Houlahan	Moore
Correa	Hoyer	Morelle
Costa	Huffman	Moulton
Courtney	Hurd (TX)	Mucarsel-Powell
Cox (CA)	Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)
Craig	Jayapal	Nadler
Crist	Jeffries	Napolitano
Crow	Johnson (GA)	Neal
Cuellar	Johnson (TX)	Neguse
Cunningham	Joyce (OH)	Norcross
Davids (KS)	Kaptur	O'Halleran
Davis (CA)	Katko	Ocasio-Cortez
Davis, Danny K.	Keating	Omar
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (IL)	Pallone
Dean	Kennedy	Panetta
DeFazio	Khanna	Pappas
DeGette	Kildee	Pascrell
DeLauro	Kilmer	Payne

NAYS—150

Abraham	Gohmert	Newhouse
Aderholt	Gonzalez (OH)	Norman
Allen	Gooden	Nunes
Amash	Gosar	Palazzo
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Pence
Babin	Green (TN)	Perry
Baird	Griffith	Posey
Banks	Grothman	Reschenthaler
Barr	Guest	Rice (SC)
Bergman	Guthrie	Riggleman
Biggs	Hagedorn	Roby
Bilirakis	Harris	Rodgers (WA)
Bishop (NC)	Hartzler	Roe, David P.
Bishop (UT)	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (AL)
Brady	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Hill (AR)	Rooney (FL)
Buck	Holding	Rose, John W.
Bucshon	Hollingsworth	Rouzer
Budd	Hudson	Rutherford
Burchett	Huizenga	Scalise
Burgess	Jacobs	Schweikert
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Scott, Austin
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Sensenbrenner
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Simpson
Carter (TX)	Joyce (PA)	Smith (MO)
Chabot	Keller	Smith (NE)
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Smucker
Cline	Kinzing	Steil
Cloud	Kustoff (TN)	Taylor
Cole	LaHood	Thompson (PA)
Comer	Lamborn	Tiffany
Conaway	Latta	Tipton
Crawford	Lesko	Walberg
Crenshaw	Long	Walker
Curtis	Loudermilk	Walorski
Davidson (OH)	Lucas	Waltz
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Watkins
Duncan	Marshall	Weber (TX)
Dunn	Massie	Webster (FL)
Emmer	Mast	Wenstrup
Estes	McCarthy	Westerman
Ferguson	McClintock	Williams
Fleischmann	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Foxx (NC)	Miller	Wittman
Fulcher	Mitchell	Womack
Gaetz	Moolenaar	Woodall
Gallagher	Mooney (WV)	Wright
Garcia (CA)	Mullin	Yoho
Gianforte	Murphy (NC)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—24

Amodei	Granger	Roy
Brooks (IN)	Higgins (LA)	Shimkus
Collins (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Spano
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Steube
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Stewart
Flores	Marchant	Thornberry
Gabbard	Meuser	Timmons
Gibbs	Olson	Walden

□ 1839

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY STOPGAP USCIS STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on the Budget be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8089) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to expand premium processing for certain immigration benefits, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 8089

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Emergency Stopgap USCIS Stabilization Act”.

SECTION 2. EXPANSION OF PREMIUM PROCESSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 286(u) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1356(u)) is amended to read as follows:

“(u) PREMIUM FEE FOR CERTAIN IMMIGRATION BENEFIT TYPES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to establish and collect a premium fee for the immigration benefit types described in paragraph (2). Such fee shall be paid in addition to any other fees authorized by law, deposited as offsetting receipts in the Immigration Examinations Fee Account established under subsection (m), and used for the purposes described in paragraph (4).

“(2) IMMIGRATION BENEFIT TYPES.—Subject to reasonable conditions or limitations, the Secretary shall establish a premium fee under paragraph (1) in connection with—

“(A) employment-based nonimmigrant petitions and associated applications for dependents of the beneficiaries of such petitions;

“(B) employment-based immigrant petitions filed by or on behalf of aliens described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 203(b);

“(C) applications to change or extend nonimmigrant status;

“(D) applications for employment authorization; and

“(E) any other immigration benefit type that the Secretary deems appropriate for premium processing.

“(3) AMOUNT OF FEE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), with respect to an immigration benefit type designated for premium processing by the Secretary on or before August 1, 2020, the premium fee shall be \$2,500, except that the premium fee for a petition for classification of a nonimmigrant described in subparagraph (H)(ii)(b) or (R) of section 101(a)(15) shall be \$1,500.

“(B) OTHER IMMIGRATION BENEFIT TYPES.—With respect to an immigration benefit type designated for premium processing but not described in subparagraph (A), the initial premium fee shall be established by regulation, which shall include a detailed methodology supporting the proposed premium fee amount.

“(C) BIENNIAL ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary may adjust a premium fee under subparagraph (A) or (B) on a biennial basis by the percentage (if any) by which the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the

month of June preceding the date on which such adjustment takes effect exceeds the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the same month of the second preceding calendar year. The provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to an adjustment authorized under this subparagraph.

“(4) USE OF FEE.—Fees collected under this subsection may only be used by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to—

“(A) provide the services described in paragraph (5) to premium processing requestors;

“(B) make infrastructure improvements in adjudications processes and the provision of information and services to immigration and naturalization benefit requestors;

“(C) respond to adjudication demands, including by reducing the number of pending immigration and naturalization benefit requests; and

“(D) otherwise offset the cost of providing adjudication and naturalization services.

“(5) PREMIUM PROCESSING SERVICES.—The Secretary—

“(A) may suspend the availability of premium processing for designated immigration benefit requests only if circumstances prevent the completion of processing of a significant number of such requests within the required period; and

“(B) shall ensure that premium processing requestors have direct and reliable access to current case status information as well as the ability to communicate with the premium processing units at each service center or office that provides premium processing services.”.

(b) EXPANSION TO NEW BENEFIT REQUESTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the requirement to set a fee by regulation under section 286(u)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1356(u)(3)(B)), as amended by subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security may set a fee under that section without regard to the provisions of section 553 of title 5, United States Code, if such fee is consistent with the following:

(A) For a petition for classification under section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(1)(C)), or a petition for classification under section 203(b)(2) involving a waiver under section 203(b)(2)(B) of such Act, the fee is set at an amount not greater than \$2,500 and the required processing timeframe is not greater than 45 days.

(B) For an application under section 248 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1258) to change status to a classification described in subparagraph (F), (J), or (M) of section 101(a)(15) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)), the fee is set at an amount not greater than \$1,750 and the required processing timeframe is not greater than 30 days.

(C) For an application under section 248 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1258) to change status to be classified as a dependent of a nonimmigrant described in subparagraph (E), (H), (L), (O), (P), or (R) of section 101(a)(15) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)), or to extend such classification, the fee is set at an amount not greater than \$1,750 and the required processing timeframe is not greater than 30 days.

(D) For an application for employment authorization, the fee is set at an amount not greater than \$1,500 and the required processing timeframe is not greater than 30 days.

(2) CLARIFICATION.—The required processing timeframe for each of the applications and petitions described in paragraph (1) shall not commence until the date that all prerequisites for adjudication are received by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(c) OTHER BENEFIT REQUESTS.—In implementing the amendments made by subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop and implement processes to ensure that the availability of premium processing, or its expansion to additional immigration benefit requests, does not result in an increase in processing times for immigration benefit requests not designated for premium processing or an increase in regular processing of immigration benefit requests so designated.

SEC. 3. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide to the appropriate Committees a 5-year plan, including projected cost estimates, procurement strategies, and a project schedule with milestones, to accomplish each of the following:

(1) Establish electronic filing procedures for all applications and petitions for immigration benefits.

(2) Accept electronic payment of fees at all filing locations.

(3) Issue correspondence, including decisions, requests for evidence, and notices of intent to deny, to immigration benefit requestors electronically.

(4) Improve processing times for all immigration and naturalization benefit requests.

(b) SEMI-ANNUAL BRIEFINGS.—Not later than 180 days after submission of the plan described in paragraph (1), and on a semi-annual basis thereafter, the Secretary shall advise the appropriate Committees on the implementation status of such plan.

(c) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate Committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF FRANKLIN D. RAINES AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 88) providing for the appointment of Franklin D. Raines as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 88

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of John W. McCarter Jr. of Illinois on March 21, 2020, is filled by the appointment of Franklin D. Raines of Washington, DC. The appointment is for a term of six years, beginning the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE GRADUATING CLASS OF FIREFIGHTERS IN SALEM COUNTY NEW JERSEY

(Mr. VAN DREW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I recognize this year's graduating class of firefighters in Salem County, south Jersey.

I was honored to attend and see this class in action at the Fire Academy FFI recruit graduation earlier this month. They are not just a team; they are a family.

This special class was hardened and unified in the midst of a nationwide coronavirus. I am so proud to be able to represent these men and women in Congress and to recognize them for their feat.

They represent the resolve and the commitment that makes this great Nation even greater. Your Nation is proud of you. Your community is proud of you. We are all proud of you and the selfless work that you are all beginning. God bless you all. And God bless these United States of America.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 967, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, August 25, 2020.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 25, 2020, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5072. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits; re-

ceived July 23, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5073. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Exemption From Premarket Notification: Class II Devices [Docket No.: FDA-2019-N-2686] received July 23, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5074. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Petitions for an Administrative Stay of Action: Electrical Stimulation Devices for Self-Injurious or Aggressive Behavior [Docket No.: FDA-2016-N-1111] received July 23, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1092. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8015) to maintain prompt and reliable postal services during the COVID-19 health emergency, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-480). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 8086. A bill to provide additional appropriations for the public health and social services emergency fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 8087. A bill to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to establish a program for second draw loans and make other modifications to the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, the Budget, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 8088. A bill to provide funding to law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr.

CLEAVER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 8089. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to expand premium processing for certain immigration benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned, considered and passed.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 8090. A bill to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to provide a limitation on the recoupment of Coronavirus Relief Fund amounts; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Ms.

HAALAND, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CASE, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. TITUS, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 8091. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide to States the total amount of funds for the costs to the States of activating the National Guard in response to the COVID-19 pandemic; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself,

Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MFUME, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. NEGUSE):

H.R. 8092. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to establish the methods by which individuals may apply for an absentee ballot in elections for Federal office, to permit individuals to cast absentee ballots at polling places and early voting locations on or before the date of the election, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HURD of Texas:

H.R. 8093. A bill to adjust the boundary of Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROSE of New York (for himself,

Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. GRIF-FITH, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 8094. A bill to address behavioral health and well-being among health care professionals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 8095. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a grant program to provide funds for the removal of Confederate symbols, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Mr. KING

of New York, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Ms. STEFANK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BANKS, and Mr. MEUSER):

H. Res. 1093. A resolution establishing a "Bill of Rights" to support United States law enforcement personnel nationwide in their work to protect our communities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 8086.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 8087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 8088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 8089.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform rule of Naturalization."

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 8090.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 8091.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 8092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 5, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 17 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HURD of Texas:

H.R. 8093.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 provides Congress with the power to "dispose of and

make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory and other Property belonging to the United States."

By Mr. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 8094.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof".

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 8095.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 838: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. COMER.

H.R. 1174: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1224: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1367: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1450: Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. DEAN, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. KIM, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. COX of California, and Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 2201: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 2381: Mr. TIFFANY.

H.R. 2442: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 2694: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 4150: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 5297: Mr. ARMSTRONG and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 5936: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 6104: Mr. KIND, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 6142: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 6169: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CASE, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 6364: Ms. DELBENE and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 6561: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 6626: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 6654: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 6776: Mr. CASE and Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 6897: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 6921: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 6986: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 6988: Mr. BUCK and Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 6994: Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 7071: Ms. CRAIG, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COOPER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. MILLER, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 7085: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 7158: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 7219: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 7232: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 7370: Mr. LEVIN of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 7521: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 7601: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 7632: Mr. BOST, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 7640: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 7673: Mr. NADLER and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 7691: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 7777: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. KELLER, and Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 7809: Mr. CRIST and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 7819: Mr. ROSE of New York and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 7842: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 7864: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 7913: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 7947: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 8003: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COOPER, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 8020: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 8027: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 8061: Mr. HASTINGS and Ms. SHALALA.

H.R. 8069: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. JACOBS.

H. Res. 913: Mr. KIM.

H. Res. 959: Mr. DELGADO.